

W. D. Thompson

AUTHENTIC REPORT

OF THE

DISCUSSION HELD IN ROME

ON THE EVENINGS OF FEBRUARY 9TH AND 10TH, 1872,

BETWEEN

CATHOLIC PRIESTS AND EVANGELICAL
MINISTERS,

CONCERNING THE COMING OF ST. PETER TO ROME.

TRANSLATED BY

WILLIAM ARTHUR, A.M.,

AUTHOR OF "ITALY IN TRANSITION," ETC., ETC.

THIRTEENTH THOUSAND.

London:

T. WOOLMER, 2, CASTLE STREET, CITY ROAD, E.C.
AND 66, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

HAYMAN BROTHERS AND LILLY,
PRINTERS,
HATTON HOUSE, 113, FARRINGDON ROAD,
LONDON, E.C.

a. men 1 Dec 28

Clear return &
J. D. Thompson
57 Washington St
Chicago

252

au81

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

HAD Mr. Disraeli, when writing "Lothair," laid a scene in Rome, not four years after the battle of Mentana, in which the hall of a pontifical academy, brilliantly lighted by Catholic hands, was crowded with an audience divided into two parts: Roman Catholics on the right, admitted by yellow tickets; non-Romanists on the left, admitted by red; to hear a debate between Priests and Protestants on the question whether St. Peter ever was in Rome;—had he set over the discussion four Presidents; on the one side a Roman Prince with an Advocate of fame and title, on the other, two Pastors, the one of Hebrew extraction, the other an English Methodist residing in Italy;—had he introduced as Disputants a distinguished Canon, with two erudite Roman ecclesiastics, and opposed to these the famous ex-Monk Gavazzi, with a Pastor of the old Waldensian Church, and a converted Franciscan,—a Methodist;—further, had he represented the debate as able and fervent, yet proceeding with temper and ending with shaking of hands, would not the critics have said that, of all the improbable things in the book, that was the most extravagant? Yet, at seven o'clock on the evening of February 9th, 1872, that scene opened, not to dissolve until after eleven, and then only to re-open on the evening following. And the public already knows, through the correspondence of "The Times," "The Daily News," and other papers, that the conditions just named were fulfilled.

Besides its intrinsic interest, the Discussion here translated will always claim a place in the history of thought and of political

institutions; for here inquiry advances to joust with authority in fair and honourable lists, opened on ground where for ages he durst not show his head; and here a public meeting, for earnest but orderly debate, is held where, of all institutions, the public discussion has been the most alien, and popular assemblies have been only for rites or amusements, unless we except the lottery. But the deepest interest of the discussion will lie in its bearing on religious belief; always the strongest force in moulding both thought and institutions.

For Roman Catholics, owing to the principles whereon they have, for ages, proceeded in the construction of their ecclesiastical system, the question treated is vital. It touches nothing less than their foundations, and new life is thrown into the inquiry when it is urged on the one side and the other, not far off from Rome, or by men of alien blood and sympathies; but when the voices of the speakers stir the air that fans the Vatican, and at every turn the words "here," "in this city," "in this metropolis," "we," "us," "in this centre of the world," fall from lips glowing with the local associations of the past, and earnestly contending for the vantage ground of faith whence to command the future.

The following statement of the circumstances which led to the discussion is condensed from the "*Corriere Evangelico*" for February, published in Padua, and has the authority of one of the Presidents, Mr. Piggott. On Wednesday, January 31st, Sciarelli, according to his custom, announced in the journal "*La Capitale*" the subject he should treat on the evening following, the pretended arrival of St. Peter in Rome. Already the order had issued from the Vatican to accept a public challenge from the Evangelicals; and what subject could be more propitious? especially as the form wherein Sciarelli had advertised his Thesis committed him to the proof of a universal negative. On Thursday evening Sciarelli had no sooner mounted the pulpit than a large document was delivered to him, signed by six Priests, announcing that they accepted a public discussion upon his Thesis in the terms advertised in "*La Capitale*,"

on condition that Presidents of the debate should be chosen on both sides, and rules for fair play and good order be arranged beforehand.

The next day, Signori Sciarelli and Piggott, on the part of the Protestants, and Signori Cipolla and Cicolini on that of the Catholics, met in the room in Via Barbieri, and agreed that the proposition discussed should stand in the terms of the advertisement ; that each side should choose three disputants and two Presidents ; and that admission should be by ticket, and in equal numbers for each side.

The Presidents selected were Prince Chigi, of Campagnano, brother of the well-known Papal Nuncio to Paris, and the celebrated Advocate Commendatore De Dominicis-Tosti, for the Catholics ; and, on the other side, the Rev. Henry J. Piggott, and Dr. Hermann Philip. They held their preliminary meetings in the palace of Prince Chigi, and resolved to employ two sets of reporters ; for the Catholics those of the Œcumenical Council, for the Protestants those of the Italian Parliament ; from the collation of whose work an authenticated report was to be published.

The journals fanned the rising interest ; and had the tickets been as many thousands as they were hundreds, they would have been all taken. In front of the Presidents sat the Disputants, three on a side, then the reporters, and then the dense and orderly audience. The names of the Disputants on the Catholic side did not transpire till the night of meeting. Canon Fabiani, an accomplished scholar and archæologist, came forward with Signor Cipolla, a priest of Rome, and Signor Guidi, whose repute for talent and learning is considerable. As their opponents, Sciarelli, a Neapolitan, and Ribetti, from the Alpine valleys, represented the two ends of Italy, while Gavazzi, the Roman, stood on his native soil, joining hands with them both, to meet as free men those who at last came out to fight against them with only the lawful weapons of thought.

With exceeding pleasure I give literally the last paragraph of Mr. Piggott's account in the "*Corriere Evangelico* : " " One word

in conclusion : a word of praise to our adversaries, justly merited by the spirit of courtesy and fair play in which everything was arranged and conducted by them from the beginning to the end. Neither from the presidential chair, nor from the bench of the Disputants, had we to complain of an ungentlemanly (*inurbana*) word, or of an act less than honourable. Be this said for love of the truth, and as a return of politeness."

The importance of this discussion in Italy may be partly gathered from the fact that, throughout the country, the press took it up with gravity and intelligent interest. And, on the other side, from the appointment by the Pope of a *triduum*, or holy day of three successive days, for a ceremonial in St. Peter's, as first announced in the "Daily News," and afterwards fully described in the "Times" of March the 18th, with a view to "offer reparation for the horrible blasphemies with which, in these latter days, infidels have denied the presence and death of St. Peter in Rome." *Decrevit habendas triduum ferias*, as Cicero would have said; and thousands crowded to the cathedral, of whom many added to the reparation, the further homage to St. Peter of devoutly kissing the toe of his statue. Since the discussion the journal "*La Capitale*," of March the 6th, occupies two pages with a report of the "Solemn Inauguration of the Italian Bible Society," in the *Sala Argentina* in Rome; to which it describes the population as crowding "with an ardour that seemed like fanaticism." There Ribetti delivered to the vast crowd the solemn greeting of the old Waldensian Church, and at the name of Sciarcelli, who followed the celebrated French orator, Father Hyacinthe, "the assembly broke out into earnest plaudits." And Gavazzi rose amid great applause, and sat down amid greater.

It need hardly be said that, as with the original, so with this translation, the desire for speed forbade any aim at literary finish. One thing only have I attempted,—to enable the English reader, as far as the case admitted, to see through my sentences those of the speakers.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE speeches delivered in the Discussion, excepting that of Signor Francesco Sciarelli, Minister of the Evangelical Methodist Church, were taken down by reporters on both sides; and are printed as they came out after the collation of the two, without even the revision necessary to improve the style.

DECLARATION ATTACHED TO THE FOOT OF THE AUTHENTIC MANUSCRIPT.

THE present manuscript, to the number of two hundred and sixty-eight pages, and of thirty-one lines to the page, is a faithful and exact copy, by the undersigned Presidents approved in all and every its parts, both of the thesis read by the Evangelical Minister, Signor Francesco Sciarelli, and of the speeches delivered by the Catholic Priests and Evangelical Ministers on the evenings of the ninth and tenth of this current month of February, in the hall of the *Pontificia Accademia Tiberina*, on the question of the coming of St. Peter to Rome.

In Faith, &c.

Rome, this twenty-fourth day of February, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two.

COMM. GIOVANNI BATTISTA DE DOMINICIS-TOSTI,
Avv. Conc.

M. CHIGI, *Principe di Campagnano*.

HENRY J. PIGGOTT, B.A.

HERMANN PHILIP, D.D., M.D.

FRIDAY EVENING, SEVEN O'CLOCK.

PRESIDENT SIGNOR De Dominicis-Tosti.—Most honourable gentlemen, the discussion is opened upon this thesis,—(reads from the four hundred and ninety-second number of "*La Capitale*,")—“Signor Francesco Sciarelli, Evangelical Minister, will give a public lecture, *in which he will show by arguments drawn from the Bible and the Holy Fathers that St. Peter never was in Rome.*”

I pray you, most honourable gentlemen, not to give expressions either of approval or disapprobation, that the debate may proceed with order and tranquillity.

Gavazzi.—Gentlemen Presidents, permit me a word! As we are here convened not for a worldly or theatrical end, but for a religious one, I think that we should begin with prayer; and since no one can forbid that prayer which Jesus Christ taught us, I would beg of the President that some one should commence with the Lord's Prayer. This no one can forbid.

Canon **Fabiani** says that it is to be supposed that every one has already prayed privately, and that he does not see the necessity of doing it in public.

President De Dominicis-Tosti.—The necessity of this praying in public does not appear, every one does it for himself; besides in this we must proceed according to the stipulations agreed upon between the parties, between the Presidents.

Prince di **Campagnano** wishes to say that time can be given that every one may offer up a prayer inwardly, before commencing the discussion.

This time having been given, the President, De Dominicis-Tosti, alls upon Signor Sciarelli to read his paper.

Sciarelli.—Gentlemen, I should very willingly have resigned to my honourable colleagues, more experienced than I, the honour of developing the thesis which is to form the subject of our discussion, if in the conditions of debate previously settled it had not been resolved that I must do it, as being the person by whom the discussion itself was proposed. Confident, therefore, not in my

abilities, which little avail, but in the undeniable and irrecusable character of the proofs I shall employ, I am here before you, gentlemen, to show the falsity of the Roman Catholic belief with regard to the *arrival and pontificate of St. Peter in Rome*.

All that Catholic theologians have hitherto asserted with regard to such a belief, may be summed up in these words:—*St. Peter came to Rome in the second year of the reign of Claudius; that is, in the forty-second of the vulgar era; here he held the pontificate for twenty-five years; and here was martyred in the year 66, in the time of the Emperor Nero*. Now, against this belief, I shall prove that ST. PETER DID NOT COME TO ESTABLISH HIS SEE IN ROME FROM 42 TO 46 OF THE VULGAR ERA, AND THAT NOT HAVING COME DURING THIS TIME HE COULD NOT HAVE HELD THE PONTIFICATE HERE FOR THE SPACE OF TWENTY-FIVE YEARS, NOR HERE HAVE SUFFERED MARTYRDOM IN THE SAME YEAR OF 66 IN THE TIME OF THE EMPEROR NERO.

We are well convinced and persuaded that St. Peter could not have come to establish his see in Rome in the second year of the reign of Claudius, that is, in the forty-second of the vulgar era, for the following reasons. According to the most accurate and most accredited calculations, and according to the results obtained in his investigations by the very learned Roman Catholic Ellendorf, Professor in the University of Berlin, the conversion of St. Paul must have taken place in the thirty-ninth year of the Christian era. Now in the Epistle which this Apostle wrote to the Galatians, it is said, Gal. i. 15–18:—"But when it pleased Him who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by His grace to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the Gentiles, immediately I condescended not to flesh and blood, neither went I to Jerusalem to the Apostles who were before me; but I went to Arabia, and again I returned to Damascus. Then after three years I went to Jerusalem to see Peter, and I tarried with him fifteen days." (This quotation is according to the translation of Monsignor Martini, from which I take every passage of the Bible, in order that doubt or misunderstanding may not arise.)* Three years, then, after his conversion, that is, just in the year 42 of the vulgar era, St. Paul went up to Jerusalem, and

* As far as possible to meet this view of Signor Sciarelli, all his quotations of Scripture are given in English, not from the Authorized Version, but from the Douay.

for what? To visit St. Peter. This Apostle, therefore, in the second year of the reign of Claudius, that is, in the forty-second of the Christian era, had not yet come to Rome. But it may be said, "Perhaps he came immediately after the visit paid to him by St. Paul." Let us see. In the book of the Acts of the Apostles after this same voyage of St. Paul to Jerusalem is named, this is said: Acts ix. 31-35:—"Now the Church had peace throughout all Judæa and Galilee and Samaria, and was edified, walking in the fear of the Lord, and was filled with the consolation of the Holy Ghost. It came to pass that Peter, as he passed through, visiting all, came to the saints who dwelt in Lydda. And he found there a certain man named Eneas who had kept his bed for eight years, who was ill of the palsy. And Peter said to him, Eneas, the Lord Jesus Christ healeth thee: arise, and make thy bed. And immediately he arose. And all that dwelt at Lydda and Saron saw him, who were converted to the Lord."

St. Peter then, after the Apostle St. Paul had left Jerusalem, began to go about every where, and thus he came to Lydda, a country town eight leagues distant from Jerusalem. How, therefore, could he have come to Rome immediately after the visit paid him by St. Paul? But perhaps he came later, that is, after his stay in Lydda. Let us observe. In the same book of the Acts of the Apostles, it is written, Acts xi. 36-43:—"And in Joppa there was a certain disciple named Tabitha, which by interpretation is called Dorcas: this woman was full of good works and almsdeeds which she did. And it came to pass in those days, that she was sick, and died: whom when they had washed, they laid her in an upper chamber. And forasmuch as Lydda was nigh unto Joppa, the disciples hearing that Peter was there, sent unto him two men, desiring that he would not be slack to come unto them. And Peter rising up went with them. And when he was come they brought him into the upper chamber: and all the widows stood about him weeping and showing the coats and garments which Dorcas made them. And they all being put forth, Peter kneeling down prayed, and turning to the body he said, Tabitha, arise! And she opened her eyes. Seeing Peter she sat up. And giving her his hand he lifted her up. And when he had called the saints and the widows, he presented her alive. And it was made known throughout all Joppa, and many believed in the Lord. And it came to pass *that he abode many days in Joppa* with one Simon a tanner."

If St. Peter then, after being in Lydda, was called to Joppa, where he stayed many days, he certainly would not have come to Rome shortly after his stay in Lydda. But perhaps he came immediately after his departure from Joppa? Let us see. The same book of the Acts of the Apostles, having told of Cornelius the Centurion, who had sent to Joppa to call St. Peter, thus observes: "He arose and went with them.....on the morrow, after he entered into Cæsarea." And St. Peter having preached Jesus Christ to Cornelius, and to those who were with him, they believed, and were baptized. Then they "*desired him that he would stay with them some days.*" (Acts x., *passim*.) So St. Peter, after he had remained many days in Joppa, was called by Cornelius to Cæsarea, in which he was prayed to remain some days. It is certain that he could not have come to Rome immediately after his stay in Joppa. But perhaps he came here as soon as he had passed a few days in Cæsarea. It is stated in the same book of the Acts of the Apostles, that after the conversion and baptism of Cornelius, (Acts xi. 2,) "*And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem*, then they that were of the circumcision contended with him."

Now if St. Peter, after he had remained for some days in Cæsarea, went up to Jerusalem, and there had to reason with the circumcision, evidently he could not have come to Rome after he had passed a few days in Cæsarea.

Thus, in the second year of the reign of Claudius, namely, in the forty-second of the vulgar era, if St. Peter had to accomplish all these journeys, to endure all these labours, and to fulfil all this mission, how can the theologians of Catholicism assert with reason that in that same year he came to Rome? Besides which, the book of the Acts of the Apostles having so particularly and circumstantially described to us all this period of the life of St. Peter, how comes it that it holds its peace with regard to his journey to Rome? Let us say frankly, either the journey of St. Peter to Rome in the second year of the reign of Claudius is one of those tales which, taking birth one knows not how, passed on from age to age, until they were examined and reviewed by some one with good eyes; or, on the other hand, the silence of the Acts of the Apostles is an unpardonable silence, and one that would dispel our belief in its inspiration. Out of this is no escape. Now every one who believes in the inspiration of the Bible will feel it impossible to admit the second supposition. We must, then, admit the first,

namely, that it is false that St. Peter came to Rome in the second year of the reign of Claudius, and in the forty-second of the vulgar era. And this Antonio Pagi the Franciscan Friar well saw, who, commenting upon the Annals of Baronius, did not hesitate to affirm that the supposition of St. Peter's coming to Rome in the second year of the reign of Claudius is in contradiction to Holy Writ. Calmet affirms that, even before his times, the hypotheses of Baronius were given up as impossible; and finally, the Dominican Friars in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* of 1822 have openly declared themselves against the hypotheses of Baronius, and say that Peter came to Rome only during the reign of Nero. Here, then, is a respectable number of writers, more than orthodox, who, instead of adopting the curious legend, wish to preserve intact the authority of the Acts of the Apostles, and to respect the law of sound criticism.

But perhaps the theologians of Catholicism might add, if St. Peter did not come to Rome in the second year of the reign of Claudius, he might have come in the year following; for, after all, it is not an article of faith that he came just in the forty-second year of the Christian era; a year more or less does not destroy credence in his journey to Rome. Very well; but then what would become of the twenty-five years in which the same theologians affirm that St. Peter held the pontificate in Rome? By all means let us see if this be possible.

History teaches us as undoubted that Herod Agrippa, the grandson of Herod the Great, died in the year 45 of the vulgar era. Now, according to what is said in the Acts of the Apostles, this Herod Agrippa, not long before his death, (Acts xii. 1-4, 12-17,) "stretched forth his hands, to afflict some of the Church. And he killed James the brother of John with the sword. And seeing that it pleased the Jews, he proceeded to take up *Peter also*. Now it was in the day of the azymes. And when he had apprehended him, he cast him into prison, delivering him to four files of soldiers to be kept, intending after the pasch to bring him forth to the people.....And considering he came to the house of Mary the mother of John, who was surnamed Mark, where many were gathered together and praying. And when he knocked at the door of the gate, a damsel came to hearken, whose name was Rhoda, and as soon as she heard Peter's voice, she opened not the gate for joy, but running in she told that Peter stood before the gate. But they said to her, Thou art mad. But she affirmed that it was so.

Then said they, It is his angel. But Peter continued knocking. And when they had opened, they saw him, and were astonished. But he beckoning to them with his hand, to hold their peace, told how the Lord had brought him out of prison, and he said, Tell these things to James, and to the brethren. And going out, he went *into another place.*"

If then not long before the year 45 of the vulgar era, St. Peter was put in prison by Herod Agrippa, was liberated by an angel, and went to the house of Mary the mother of John, surnamed Mark, it is a proof that up to this time he had not come to Rome, but that he was still in Jerusalem, and that his pretended pontificate of twenty-five years in the seat of empire must be shortened at least by three years.

However, the Catholic theologians might here reply to us, "St. Peter came to Rome just after being liberated by the angel, for the same book of the Acts tells us that he departed and went elsewhere; * this elsewhere was Rome." But this elsewhere, could it ever be Rome? Was Rome a hovel or a village, that it should be designated by the mean word, "elsewhere?" Had not Rome its proper name as much as Lydda, or Joppa, or Cæsarea &c., that recourse must be had to the obscure word "elsewhere?" Is it natural? Is it possible? Is it after the habit of the writer of the Acts of the Apostles? But, above all, is it corroborated by that which further on in the Holy Scripture is said concerning the Apostle Peter? Let us see.

According to what is said in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians the apostolic council held in Jerusalem took place fourteen years after St. Paul had gone up to that city to visit St. Peter, namely, in the fifty-sixth of the Christian era. Now, in this council we find that St. Peter was present, because it is said in the book of the Acts: (Acts xv. 1, 2, 4-7, 12:)—"And some coming down from Judæa, taught the brethren, that except you be circumcised after the manner of Moses, you cannot be saved. And when Paul and Barnabas had no small contest with them they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain others of the other side, should go up *to the Apostles* and priests to Jerusalem about this question. And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received by the Church, and by the Apostles, and ancients, declaring how great things God had done with them. But there arose some of the sect of the Pharisees that believed, saying, They must be circum-

* Martini's translation of *εἰς ἕτερον τόπον* is *altrove*.—TRANSLATOR.

cised, and be commanded to observe the law of Moses. And the Apostles and ancients assembled to consider of this matter. And when there had been much disputing, *Peter rising up*, said to them, Men and brethren, you know that in former days God made choice among us, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel and believe.....And all the multitude held their peace, and they heard Barnabas and Paul telling what great signs and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them."

Therefore in the year 56 of the Christian era, St. Peter was still in Jerusalem: how, then, could he have come to Rome to establish his see just after being liberated from the hands of Herod by means of an angel? How can the word "elsewhere" be understood as designating the capital of the empire? But it may be suggested that St. Peter, having come to Rome immediately after he was liberated from prison, may have returned to Jerusalem to attend the Council. To this objection we reply: Did the Council of Jerusalem originate in an act of convocation, by invitation, or by letter? Does it not, on the contrary, appear that the Apostles, instead of having to be invited before the time to come at a date fixed beforehand, were found together in Jerusalem as in their settled abode, in their natural centre, up to that time? But even admitting that the Council had been previously convoked, how comes it, in that case, that St. Peter, coming from Rome, said nothing on that most solemn occasion of his own journey, which would have been of so great importance, or of the new and shining destinies of Rome? And such silence is all the more inexplicable, inasmuch as in the same meeting St. Paul and St. Barnabas rendered an exact and particular account of what had been wrought among the Gentiles by them. The advances made by Christianity were enumerated in that solemn assembly, and was Rome a matter so small? It must then be confessed that St. Peter could not have come to Rome, there to establish his see, before the Council of Jerusalem, that is, till the year 56 of the Christian era; and that his pretended pontificate of twenty-five years must be cut short by fifteen.

But could not St. Peter at least have come to Rome immediately after the Council at Jerusalem? We find that he could not, since from the Epistle to the Galatians we gather that, on the contrary, he went to Antioch, where having encountered St. Paul, he had to endure the grave rebukes of the Apostle of the Gentiles. Galatians ii. 11-14:—

"But when *Cephas* was come to *Antioch*, I withstood him to the

face, because he was to be blamed. For before that some came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them who were of the circumcision. And to his dissimulation the rest of the Jews consented, so that Barnabas also was led by them into dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly unto the truth of the Gospel, I said to Cephias before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as the Jews do, how dost thou compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?"

But may not Peter have come to Rome after being in Antioch? Let us see. We know that St. Paul, towards the year 58 of the vulgar era, wrote his sublime and beautiful Epistle to the Romans. Now surely if St. Peter at this time had been in Rome, the Apostle of the Gentiles would have sent him a salutation, would have called him to mind, would have made some allusion to his presence and his work in this metropolis; and yet St. Paul, while in his letter saluting every one, while filling almost a chapter with greetings, and sending them to every person in office in this Church, says nothing of St. Peter. "Perhaps St. Peter was absent," will say the Catholic theologians. But how? Even suppose that, how is it explained that, in commencing his Epistle, St. Paul says, Rcm. i. 10, 11, 15?—

"Always in my prayers making request, if by any means now at length I may have a prosperous journey, by the will of God to come unto you. For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual grace, to strengthen you; so, as much as in me, I am ready to preach the Gospel to you also that are at Rome."

Now, what need of the evangelizing of St. Paul, if St. Peter already was in Rome? What gift could Paul communicate which already had not been imparted by St. Peter? Had not Peter the authority to confirm in the faith? It is evident, then, that St. Peter could not have been here in Rome at the time in which St. Paul sent his letter to the faithful in this city; and therefore the twenty-five years of his pretended pontificate in this metropolis of the empire must be reduced by seventeen.

But could not St. Peter come to Rome after the year 58? Let us see. In the year 61 of the Christian era, St. Paul arrived at Rome in person, and the brethren went out to give him the meeting. This time, certainly, St. Peter will be mentioned; and yet see

how the book of the Acts of the Apostles speaks of this event. Acts xxviii. 14-22 :—

“Where finding brethren, we were desired to tarry with them seven days : and so we went to Rome. And from thence, when the brethren had heard of us, they came to meet us as far as Appii Forum and the three taverns : whom when Paul saw, he gave thanks to God, and took courage. And when we were come to Rome, Paul was suffered to dwell by himself with a soldier that kept him. And after the third day he called together the chief of the Jews. And when they were assembled, he said to them, Men and brethren, I having done nothing against the people, or the customs of our fathers, was delivered prisoner from Jerusalem into the hands of the Romans. Who, when they examined me, would have released me, for that there was no cause of death in me. But the Jews contradicting it, I was constrained to appeal unto Cæsar ; not that I have any thing to accuse my nation of. For this cause therefore I desired to see you, and to speak to you : because that for the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain. But they said to him, We neither received letters concerning thee from Judæa, neither did any of the brethren that came hither *relate or speak any evil of thee.* But we desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest : *for as concerning this sect, we know that it is gainsayed every where.*”

Now, is it likely, is it possible, that, in the book of the Acts of the Apostles, St. Paul in Rome should be thus spoken of, if St. Peter at the same time was in the city ? How comes it that the two Apostles did not meet one another ? How comes it that the Jews of Rome had to learn anything from St. Paul concerning the Jews of Jerusalem ? How comes it that St. Peter, the Apostle of the circumcision, had not already given to them a just and exact idea of that which they go no farther than to call *a sect* ? Does not this their language show that they had not yet heard any apostolic preaching ? It is impossible, then, to think that St. Peter could have been in Rome at the time when St. Paul arrived in the city,—that is, in the year 61 of the vulgar era,—and therefore his pretended pontificate of twenty-five years must be abridged by twenty.

But could not St. Peter come to Rome after the year 61 of the vulgar era ? Let us see. St. Paul passed two years in Rome. The book of the Acts says, (Acts xxviii. 30, 31,) “And he remained two whole years in his hired lodging : and he received

all that came to him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, without prohibition."

Now, it is undoubted that he wrote hence some of his Epistles. He wrote to Philemon, (Philemon 22, 23,) "There salute thee Epaphras, my fellow prisoner in Christ Jesus; Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, and Luke, my fellow labourers." And of St. Peter what does he say? Nothing. If at this time he had been in Rome, would not St. Paul have enumerated him among the companions of his work? He wrote, besides, to the Colossians, and in the close of the Epistle he says, (Col. iv. 10, 11,) "Aristarchus my fellow prisoner saluteth you, and Mark the cousin-german of Barnabas, (touching whom you have received commandments: if he come unto you, receive him;) and Jesus, that is called Justus: who are of the circumcision: these only are my helpers in the kingdom of God; who have been a comfort to me."

Here St. Paul speaks of all those that surrounded him, and who were a help to him in the work of the kingdom of God. How comes it that of St. Peter he does not say anything? It is a proof that St. Peter was not in Rome. And, finally, all agree in admitting that the Second Epistle to Timothy was written to St. Paul in the year 66 of the Christian era, shortly before he suffered martyrdom. Well, in this it is written, (2 Timothy iv. 9-11, 16,) "For Demas hath left me, loving the world, and is gone to Thessalonica; Crescens into Galatia, Titus into Dalmatia: only Luke is with me. Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is profitable unto me for the ministry. At my first answer no man stood with me, but all forsook me: may it not be laid to their charge."

Now could St. Paul have pitifully complained, saying that Luke alone was found as his companion, and that no one had stood by him in his first defence, and that all had forsaken him, in case St. Peter had then been in Rome? Do you mean that that Apostle had rendered himself culpable of this base desertion? He was a prisoner, perhaps the theologians of Catholicism will say. Well, in that case, St. Paul would certainly have mentioned to Timothy the imprisonment of his co-Apostle, in the same way in which to Philemon he had mentioned the imprisonment of Epaphras, and to the Corinthians he had named Sosthenes, who was with him in prison. It is therefore by necessity that we conclude that in the year in which this letter was written St. Peter had not yet come to Rome; but the year in which the letter was written is the year 66 of the

vulgar era ; and the year 66 of the vulgar era is, for Catholic theologians, the year in which St. Peter had to suffer martyrdom. Then, according to that which the Holy Scriptures teach us, it is not true that St. Peter came to Rome to establish his see here.

And further, besides what hitherto we have said, we find in the Holy Scripture that St. Peter, in order to be faithful to the *special mission* received from Jesus Christ, should not and could not, by any means, come to Rome to establish his residence. Let us see if that be true. In his Epistle to the Galatians, St. Paul writes the following words, Gal. ii. 6-9 : "But of them who seemed to be something, (what they were sometime it is nothing to me. God accepteth not the person of man,) for to me they that seemed to be something added nothing. But contrariwise, when they had seen that to me was committed the Gospel of the uncircumcision, as to Peter was that of the circumcision. (For He who wrought in Peter to the Apostleship of the circumcision, wrought in me also among the Gentiles)."

It is true that all the Apostles, without distinction, had from Jesus Christ the command to go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature ; but those words written in the Epistle to the Galatians show us that St. Peter had further received a *special mission*, that, namely, of preaching the Gospel to the Hebrews, to the circumcised. Now, how could the Apostle of the Gentiles have written that to St. Peter was committed the Gospel of the circumcision, that God had powerfully worked in St. Peter for the apostleship of the circumcision, if St. Peter had betaken himself to Rome, there to set up his residence in a city of the uncircumcised, a city of the Gentiles ? Perhaps St. Peter did not obey the *special mission* received from Jesus Christ. But the Acts of the Apostles bear witness to the work that he did in Jerusalem and in the country round about ; and his Epistle written from Babylon to the inhabitants of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, (1 Peter i. 1,) shows us that his residence was in the centre of the dispersion of Israel.

Neither avails the assertion of Catholic theologians and others in regard to this Epistle of St. Peter bearing date* from Babylon, wishing us to believe that the Apostle intended to designate Rome under the name of Babylon. What ? they say the date from Babylon is not to be understood literally. St. Peter was writing

* In the Italian, *data* is here used for the place where, without including the time when, the *litteræ* were *datae*.—TRANSLATOR.

from Rome ; but he said Babylon to hide by this metaphor the true place of his dwelling, that he might not fall into persecution. But was St. Peter once more timorous as when *for three times* he denied his Master ? Was he not now the same who, before any of the others, spoke with such courage on the day of Pentecost ? Was he not the same who, to those of the Sanhedrim, had said, " If it be just in the sight of God, to hear you rather than God, judge ye ? " (Acts iv. 19,)

Of no more avail are the other kinds of assertions which are objected concerning this date of Babylon, since all have been abundantly refuted by men very learned in the Holy Scriptures, and in the history of ancient times. Here is what the learned Michaelis has said : " It is exceedingly strange that the Apostle having dated his letter from Babylon, it should enter the head of any commentator to give a mystical sense to this word, rather than take it in its proper sense, since in the first century the ancient Babylon was in existence. It is true that it might be called desolate, if compared with what it had been in the time of Nebuchadnezzar ; nevertheless, we gather from Strabo that it was not a heap of ruins, nor void of inhabitants. The simple epistolary language does not admit of poetical figures, and although in a poem written to extol Gottingen, we might bear its being called Athens ; if a professor of this university attached to one of his letters, written from Gottingen, the date of Athens, he would show such bad taste as to make himself ridiculous. Thus, although it is not unsuitable to the poetical language of the Apocalypse to make a metaphor of Babylon, in an epistle which is literal, and not metaphorical, Peter would never have called the city from which he wrote by any name but the literal one."

But is not patristic tradition in favour of the Catholic theologians ? Have not Eusebius, St. Jerome, and other fathers of the Church asserted it ? It appears impossible that they should always blindly go upon the testimony of others ! Now, first of all, Eusebius did not assert that it was so. He reported this statement as a simple opinion, and even remarked that this metaphor appeared to him rather forced. Besides, we must remember that the assent of St. Jerome, and of all the Fathers, depends upon these words of Eusebius himself, from which they have all taken this statement, so that this general consent is similar to a crowd of persons who repeat as true a fable which every one of them has heard told and affirmed by one and the same man. Of what value, then, is the voice

of thousands and thousands? None. Besides which, it is beyond doubt that among the Fathers, the writers anterior to Eusebius make no mention whatever of this metaphor; and it is further beyond doubt that, according to the testimony of Clarke, the ancient writers nearest to Babylon, such as the Syrians and the Arabs, believed that this name ought to be taken literally. It is indubitable, then, that setting aside chronological arguments drawn from the Holy Scriptures, we can by the words of St. Paul, written in the Epistle to the Galatians, prove that St. Peter, if he meant to be faithful, as truly he was, to the *special mission* received from Jesus Christ, should not and could not come to Rome, there to set up his residence.

Now that we have demonstrated by the Holy Scriptures the impossibility of the journey of St. Peter, and his pontificate in Rome, we wish to see if in the times nearest to the Apostles it was believed or not. The theologians of Catholicism say, "Yes;" we maintain, "No." Let us see which is right.

They cite three documents: first, *the Epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians*; secondly, *the Epistle of St. Ignatius to the Romans*; thirdly, the authority of *Papias*.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. CLEMENT TO THE CORINTHIANS.

This celebrated Epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians was undoubtedly written before the year 70 of the Christian era, because it speaks of the temple of Jerusalem, and of Jewish rites as still existing. In it there is no allusion, such as the theologians of Catholicism pretend, to the journey or the pontificate of St. Peter in Rome, and only from one passage, the authenticity of which critics have suspected, is it gathered that at this time St. Peter and St. Paul were already departed. Here are the words:—"Peter, from wrongful ill-will, endured not one or two, but many travails, and in this manner, having testified, he went to the place of glory which he merited for himself. Paul, from an equal ill-will, endured the conflict of patience, being seven times put into chains, and scourged and stoned, a herald in the east and in the west, he bore witness before the rulers, and passed out of the world, and went to the holy place." Now, where is here anything said concerning the voyage and the pontificate of St. Peter in Rome? Very vague, on the contrary, is the way in which St. Clement expresses

himself concerning St. Peter. He says that this Apostle died for bearing witness to the faith, but he does not say, and he does not leave it to be inferred, that he had died in Rome. If, however, it is true, as some critics hold, among whom are Cotelierius and Gallandi, that this passage, quoted from St. Clement, is comment and interpolation, surprising would be his silence concerning the death of the two most celebrated Apostles, since it must have taken place here in Rome under his own eyes, and since he had so fine an occasion for speaking of it,—a proof this, that St. Clement did not believe in the journey and pontificate of St. Peter in Rome.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. IGNATIUS TO THE ROMANS.

This Epistle of St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, to the Romans, was written from Smyrna, in the year 107 of the Christian era, while St. Ignatius was being conveyed to Rome to be here exposed to the wild beasts. Now without remarking that all his Epistles were much corrupted, and that it still rests uncertain if, in the edition which is taken for the best, they are free from interpolations, it is to be observed that, in that to the Romans, there is truly a pompous eulogium of their Church, which is designated as superior to all others in the empire; but not one word giving it to be understood that it was founded by St. Peter, although the opportunity was so favourable. In this Epistle St. Ignatius begs the Romans not to interpose to withdraw him from death, because he, being God's wheat, wished to be ground under the teeth of wild beasts, that he might become worthy bread of Christ. "I do not command it to you," he adds, "like Peter and Paul, those Apostles, I, still a slave; but if I suffer, I shall be the free man of Christ, and I shall arise free in Him." Here Catholic theologians pretend to see a testimony to the journey and the pontificate of St. Peter in Rome. But is this possible? We cannot see it. The same silence is held in the Acts of St. Ignatius, written by the companions of his voyages and the witnesses of his martyrdom; who say only that, when they arrived opposite to Puzzuoli, St. Ignatius would have wished to land to go to Rome, treading in the footsteps of St. Paul; but that the ship, baffled by the winds, could not gain a landing place till they reached Porto Romano. Of St.

Peter there is not one hint; a proof that the fable of the journey and pontificate of the Apostle in the city of Rome had not been then invented.

THE AUTHORITY OF PAPIAS.

There is no one who to this day has been able to find a single writing of this Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis. His writings were lost from the beginning. Eusebius alone appears to have had them in his hands; and, pronouncing a judgment upon them, he has to say that Papias was "a man of very little understanding." But is it true that Papias bears witness to the journey and pontificate of St. Peter in Rome? Eusebius, in the second book of his "Ecclesiastical History," in the fourteenth and fifteenth chapters, reports the tradition of the journey of St. Peter to Rome. Hence he speaks of another fact,—that is, that the Christians of Rome wished to have in writing the substance of the preaching of St. Peter; and he says that then this Apostle dictated his Gospel to St. Mark. After that Eusebius adds, "This is what St. Clement tells us in the fourth book of his 'Institute;' and Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, equally testifies to it." These words are obscure, and we cannot tell whether Papias renders testimony to the journey of St. Peter to Rome, or to the Gospel written by St. Mark. Hence the testimony of Papias cannot be received, because his books do not exist; because Eusebius calls him a man of little sense; and because his testimony itself is equivocal.

It is not true, then, that in the times nearest to the Apostles, the journey and pontificate of St. Peter in Rome was believed in, as the Catholic theologians pretend.

However, Catholic theologians, to corroborate the voyage and pontificate of St. Peter in Rome, strengthen themselves and take post, as if under an inexpugnable bulwark, behind the unanimous assent of tradition which explicitly, from Irenæus to modern days, has always corroborated such an event. But we must understand one another in regard to tradition. We certainly bow before the majestic teaching of tradition, because we know that God reveals Himself in a certain sense in the development of humanity, that God in a certain way appears in the deeds of men, that the light of the Word illuminates every intelligent creature, and in them manifests its own power: but nevertheless, in traditional teaching, with the touchstone of the Bible, which for both us and the Catholic

theologians is the Word of God, we can separate the human element from the Divine; we can select the result of ignorance, of fraud, and of corruption from that of knowledge, of truth, of progress. We, in a word, admit tradition only then when it is conformed to the book of the Lord, to the Bible, and we throw it away whenever it contradicts that, or postpones it to pretended human infallibility. Hence of the unanimous consent of tradition, which from the times of Irenæus to modern times has always explicitly confirmed the journey and pontificate of St. Peter in Rome, we shall make no account, until Catholic theologians shall have refuted with undeniable and irrecusable arguments those which we have drawn from the Holy Scriptures against such a belief. Further, we must distinguish the value and force of tradition according as it is brought forward to corroborate *doctrine or fact*. When we are treating of facts, not of doctrines, tradition must be divided into two periods. In the first is to be placed the testimony of those who lived shortly after the facts to be established; in the second the testimony of those who followed in the course of years. Testimonies of the first period have a certain value, but those of the second period, if without any of the first, have not value of any sort. Now what happens in the present case? Can the Catholic theologians allege explicit, clear, luminous testimonies of men who lived shortly after the fact of the pretended arrival and pretended pontificate of St. Peter in Rome? No, certainly no! Then what avails the assent of tradition which *only* from Irenæus to modern times has testified in their favour?

Gentlemen, it is needless that I should expend more words in support of my thesis. By what I have already said for every sincere and unprejudiced conscience it remains firmly established and proved with undeniable and irrecusable arguments, that the Catholic belief which for us Evangelicals is of no moment, and for the followers of Catholicism is everything,—the belief, namely, of the arrival of St. Peter in Rome,—is impossible to be sustained, and that we are able with certainty to affirm and to proclaim on high, that St. Peter did not come to set up his seat here in Rome from the year 42 to 66 of the vulgar era, and that not having come during this time he could not here have held the pontificate for the space of twenty-five years, nor here have suffered martyrdom in the year 66, in the time of the Emperor Nero.

Let not the timorous consciences of Roman Catholics take fright at this. Criticism, it is true, is a chain of struggles, a series of

enterprises against received opinions. Where it plants its banner, nothing is seen but ruins all around; but these ruins are fertile, and in a short lapse of time, the infected air of untruth being dissipated, life will come back again, and then nothing will be seen but festivals of intelligence, of truth, and of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

The paper being ended, Canon Fabiana is the speaker.

CANON Enrico Fabiani.—However full, Gentlemen, of erudition and study we may confess the exposition to be with which our honourable opponent has opened our debate, or rather this loving conference, which we have undertaken in the desire that the truth should be always more diffused, should always further spread and gradually illuminate all minds and conquer all hearts, nevertheless it seems to me that he has wandered almost entirely from the subject and the idea which on this evening ought to be discussed between us. Did I recapitulate in few words the many and choice words of our opponent, I should remark that he has done nothing but reproduce with an array of eloquent and glowing language, and with a profusion of Biblical statements and of extracts, which have certainly been welcome to the heart of every one who loves the Divine Word, but which do not directly appertain to our proper question,—he, I say, has done nothing but reproduce here before us those arguments which, already so often repeated, have been dealt with, discussed, and, I shall say, repeating the same words which fell from the lips of my opponent, so often well confuted by learned men. Those arguments reduce themselves, firstly, to chronological difficulties drawn from the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul, against the diverse chronologies which authors—Catholic and Protestant—have brought forward to determine the precise moment of the arrival and stay of St. Peter in Rome; secondly, into the silence observed in these same Epistles, in the Acts respecting the person of Peter himself in some circumstances in which, according to the same chronologies, Peter must have been in those places of which the Acts make mention. In the third place, he said that a special charge committed to Peter, that of being the Apostle of the Circumcision, must have bound him to places in Judæa alone, and never permitted him to come to Rome. Finally, that he was in Babylon while he wrote his letters; and, in conclusion, descending from the arguments drawn from Scripture to those which may be called of the Fathers, he wished to show that, in the earliest times after

Peter, no memory existed among the Fathers of this his coming to Rome, and that, as for later ones, we must not pay to them any attention. But in thus speaking, I believe that we must not confound two things; one, namely, the circumstances, the manner, the duration, and whatever regards the stay of Peter in Rome; and the other the event around which alone our subject to-night revolves.

Here we are not speaking of how long Peter was in Rome; here we are not speaking of when and how often he may have come. The Thesis which we have to handle is very simple and clear, and reduces itself to two words, that Peter never did come here. One single hour that Peter had been in Rome would entirely destroy this Thesis; and that has nothing whatever to do with the question whether this Thesis is numbered by either us or our opponents among our articles of faith, or regarded as a simple fact. Gentlemen, the Spirit of God, which came by the means of Christ and His Apostles, to illuminate the minds of all, He that first spoke through the prophets and afterwards through the Son of God Himself, this Spirit has announced many things; but not all those which He has announced were so hidden from men that they could not have known them by other means even before that announcement. And such are the facts of history, which every man sees with his own eyes, and concerning which criticism will have the foundation sought in those proofs which still proclaim and accredit to man all other facts.

Jesus Christ came upon the earth; a child was born in Bethlehem, lived in Nazareth and Capernaum, preached, wrought miracles, was crucified under Pilate, showed Himself in the presence of men as man, and as such every eye saw Him, every heart could recognise Him. But He was the Son of God; but He was the Messiah expected of the nations; but He was the Redeemer of the whole world; and this was not seen manifestly by the eye; and for this a Divine testimony was necessary, which our opponents and those of the Church place only in the Holy Scriptures, and we place together with the Holy Scriptures in the teaching and authority of the Church and in its traditions. Let us, then, distinguish, first of all, these two sides.

First of all, let us take heed to purely historical facts which any one may see, and then let us search under these what may be spiritually revealed, mysterious, hidden. Peter came to Rome. If this fact is attested, is proved by the rules of criticism, it will

be an event of history which cannot be denied. Then we should be able to discuss, and it would be quite a different point, and very remote from the present question, whether this Peter who came was the head of the other Apostles, whether he carried with him a primacy into Rome, whether he brought an infallibility and all the grandeur of the Roman Pontificate. This is matter for Divine revelation.

It is true that when Holy Scripture states facts we must accept them, even though it was considered for a moment as not inspired, because its witnesses are witnesses which are ocular and irrefragable, as to the different works narrated; but if this testimony failed, human facts could be equally ascertained in the other way.

And here it is that we come to the historical question of to-day, here we have to prove historically the arrival in Rome of St. Peter, and here we must search for proofs according to all the rules of criticism. This is a great fact for all Christians, a great fact, as he well said in his preceding argument, (pointing to Sciarelli,) that it behoves the Church to know if she is the true catholic, or if she is another Church. This fact is, then, for all Christians of capital importance. Rome was by no means a small place, or some little village standing forsaken in a remote corner of the world. Capital of the entire world about these times, Rome saw within her bosom, flowing in with all facility, the multitude of the nations from every side, and with it the multitude of Christians. History tells us, and criticism, that for a hundred reasons the Christians, to whatever race they belonged, did no other than rush to Rome; some because they were here dragged as martyrs, as happened to Ignatius of Antioch; some because they came to learn ancient history, ancient traditions, and ancient learning, as did Hegesippus; here came heretics, as Valentinus and Marcion, as so many others, endeavouring to deceive the heads of the Roman Church, and to draw them over to their party; hither came Irenæus, hither came Polycarp, hither came hundreds and hundreds whom now I do not remember, neither could I enumerate them all, to discuss the affairs of this Church and of the Church universal. It was a continual going and coming. Origen, Hippolyte, Tertullian, and hundreds upon hundreds of others were here at every moment; and I speak only of those illustrious for science or for rank who have left a memory, a great name; for the multitude that came to venerate the memory of the tombs of the Apostles were not able to leave a trace of their names. But even in the words of Julian the Apostate, an

indication is found that from the earliest times, when John had not yet written his Gospel, the memory of the Apostles was already venerated, and held in esteem and honour. This coming of all men, of all Christians, to Rome, rendered, then, this fact a notorious fact, a most noble one, a universal fact, of which, therefore, the memory could not be lost, could not be cancelled. It is from the memory of all those present and future that we must draw forth, according to the rules of criticism, the proofs of this historical fact, which comes before any decision whatever as to the dogmatic value which this fact might have.

Now we find this series of testimonies that our adversary has just pointed out, and which does not commence, as he says, only with Irenæus, but stretches through all the centuries, and goes up truly to the days of the Apostles themselves, through the medium of their first successors ; a series which, as [touching a] fact more known and manifest, commences with sweet and covert allusions, such as in a letter of affection a man is accustomed to make, who speaks of a thing perfectly known by himself and by him to whom he writes. Little by little it becomes the foundation of all discussions, of which what follows must take account, or to determine some other point of history less known. Let us explain ourselves.

When the Fathers of the Church wished to combat the heretics, they did not by any means find this tale new ; but from its being known and certain that Peter had been in Rome, they argued against these heretics, combatting to destroy them. And these heretics never were able to deny, and never dared to deny, those foundations which the Fathers laid for their argument. "Thou knowest," for example, says Optatus, when writing against the Donatists, "thou knowest," and you will allow me to read these words, since we must not change one of them, because they are too precious, for they issued from the mind, from the heart, from the tongue of a good man : [Reads:] "Then thou canst not deny, thou knowest in the city of Rome the episcopal chair was held by Peter from the beginning." I do not intend to examine anything that could impugn the veracity of this text. (Movement.) We shall speak of it again. I mean to say to you, how sacred this basis was which the Fathers laid down for their discourse. "Then thou knowest," he said, "thou canst not deny," "thou knowest," *igitur negare non potes, Petrus*, "in the city of Rome by Peter was held from the beginning the episcopal chair." Irenæus himself, who a short while ago was quoted by our opponent, in the same

manner, and with equal certainty, speaks: "I could enumerate all those who were instituted bishops of the Church by the Apostles and their successors down to us." He is speaking against heretics. "To these," he says, "you ought to give heed, and not to others; because that which Jesus Christ has taught to the Apostles, that is the truth, and that which the Apostles have taught to their Church and to their successors, that you should believe. Then, coming to the Churches which were founded from the beginning by the Apostles, I could number them for you; but since it is too long in this our volume to number the succession of all the Churches, by indicating the tradition of the faith announced to men, which leads from the Apostles to our time by means of the succession of the Bishops, the greatest, the most ancient, and known to all, the Church of Rome, founded and constituted by the most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, we shall confound all those who, whether it be from self-love or from error, argue against duty."

Here we are not speaking of an historical fact that did not interest any one, or one that, having occurred in some corner of the world, could remain unknown, or be easily forgotten.

They, namely, the Fathers, appeal to this certainty. Neither does that suffice. When the synchronisms of history have to be established, they take this fact as the foundation of their argument. When they wish to determine the time in which the Gospel of St. Mark was written, they appeal to that great epoch, such (much more certain than the time itself in which, according to them, the Gospel was written) as was the arrival of St. Peter in Rome. When they wished to determine the foundation of the debate, whatever it was, of Simon Magus against St. Peter himself, they speak of his arrival in Rome, and thus they proceed. In fact, all antiquity, till the beginning of that century in which unhappily the brethren of Germany and England detached themselves from the Church, recognised as a fact absolutely notorious and most public, this event, which was the foundation of all the faith of all Christianity. Now while by this fact the Church was increasing, while Rome was becoming gigantic, no one of the heretics whom I have named dared to deny this fact; and it must be noted that the same, although they recognised the grand, the lofty, the sublime power which was derived to the Church from the coming of St. Peter to Rome, did not in any way contest it; but all admitted it. Tertullian admitted it, an enemy of the

Roman Pontiffs; and the other, who calls himself the author of the *Philosophumena*, the rabid calumniator of the Pontiff St. Calixtus, his contemporary, St. Cyprian, at the same time in which between him and the Pontiff the question of baptism was agitated. And so again Firmilianus of Cæsarea, summoned on the same question. The other heretics, who came one after another, Nestorians, Jacobites, and whatever they were, never dared to deny the coming of Peter to which their enemies, the Roman Pontiffs, traced the beginning of the power which was striking them down. The most illustrious men in heresy itself were not able to deny it, while Rome dominated so much by reason of this coming. But if St. Peter never was in Rome, if he did not die in Rome, he must surely have died in some other corner of the world, and some other Church must have remembered his deeds, and shown, if nothing else, his tomb. And would she not have lifted up her voice and said, "Rome, give me back what belongs to me: Peter is not thine, but mine?"

For fourteen, for fifteen centuries, no one ever dared so to speak; and this is a most powerful argument, because it is not a fact that passes away, but a fact that abides in the memory, and of which every one was a witness, and it is so known that, (without for the present saying whether those words which a little while ago were cited from the earliest Fathers, prove directly or indirectly our Thesis,) it was so known, that these same words show it to us. St. Clement speaks of this death of Peter and Paul, and speaks of it as if already all knew it. Where he died he does not say, whether in Rome or not, because he speaks of it as of a thing that is already known and told by the lips of all. He writes to the Corinthians, and he says, "Come, come, if the authority of the examples of the Old Testament does not suffice, admit this which has come to pass amongst us,—Peter dead among us." (Movement on the side of the Evangelicals.) Do not fear for the present, I do not say, what means this "among us," whether it intends, "among us Christians," or "among us Romans." Let us leave for the moment that little question, and let us grant that it signifies not "among us Romans," but "among us Christians." "That which has happened among us you know; you know it very well." He does not say it was this and that; he does not say again where they were martyred. Why? Because "you know it," because this place is known, and this circumstance of martyrdom, and John himself in his Gospel, (and John wrote after St. Peter was dead at Rome or elsewhere: no one can doubt that the Gospel of St. John was posterior to the

death of St. Peter,) now he in his Gospel records the prophecy which before had been given by Jesus Christ that Peter should die by the death on the cross. "But when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and lead thee whither thou wouldest not." (John xxi. 18.)

Now this death had occurred already when John thus wrote the Gospel. You see how he speaks of a fact known to all the earth. He does not hint at anything, because it was not necessary to hint where this death had occurred.

Here, then, is the necessity of considering this fact as an historical fact, but an historical fact of a notoriety and of a force really singular, truly all its own. Then the testimonies of the Fathers and of all the writers that have spoken of it are the consequence, or but a single part of the consequences which flow from this fact, because every human event truly grand and truly noble carries with it many consequences; as that of the conversion of Rome carried the consequence of changing the aspect of the world. Whoever he was that converted the capital of the Roman world was the first fundamental author of that change that has transformed humanity from Paganism and Judaism into the Church; it was he who for the deities of the Capitol and for the temple of Jehovah, which had become a temple of Pharisees, substituted the Church, lowered the apex of the Roman Augur and the *miznefet* * of the High Priest, and for them substituted the tiara. A fact so solemn and grand has a thousand consequences, one of which is that contemporaries allude to it, and make one feel its value, without needing to descend to exact particulars, because all other men of the epoch knew it, affirmed it in all their language and in all their expressions.

If you allow me, I shall pause for a moment. (Brief repose.)

In order that what I have said may not appear vague to any one, I shall allow myself, not to read the testimonies of the Fathers which might be produced, but briefly to run over a list of those who have spoken directly of St. Peter's being in Rome, and of the deeds which he here accomplished, at least, down to the time of Gregory the Great. Not to be tedious, I do not push further an investigation into posterior times, (but I do not, however, restrain myself to too few generations,) because it would be useless, almost impossible, to name all those who have

* Canon Fabiani, instead of any Italian equivalent for "mitre," uses the Hebrew word to designate the head dress of the High Priest.

spoken of it. I do not go further then, because already this fact was so interesting, so public and known, and becoming every day more and more important, that it would be for the interest of any person not only in the first, but in the second, the third, the fourth and fifth and tenth century, to set himself in opposition to it, if he had the slightest pretext for denying it.

The Fathers commence, according to me, with Papias, who has been named by my opponent, and with Irenæus of Lyons,—with Irenæus, who at least in three places repeatedly speaks of this fact. Tertullian records it in his book *Of Baptism*, in the *Scorpiace*, and in the book against Marcion. Then Clement of Alexandria, then the author of the *Philosophumena*, then Origen in two places, and Cyprian in two places; afterwards the author of the book against Rebaptizers, a bishop, and probably a Roman Pontiff, coeval with St. Cyprian, St. Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea, Arnobius, Victor Petavionensis, Peter of Alexandria, Lactantius in his book of the *Divine Institutions*, and in his book on the *Death of Persecutors*, if this book is by Lactantius, and if not, the author of this book is another witness; Eusebius of Cæsarea, from whom I shall beg to read one single testimony, not as a proof, but to point out the state of the question, as we are accustomed to accept and to compare it in historic facts, which is by this author tolerably well indicated.

This passage is taken from the Theophany of Eusebius himself, fragment 5, published in the new *Bibliotheca* of the most erudite Cardinal Mai, at page 120. He reads:—"Of the things done by Peter, the proofs are those same Churches which shortly afterwards shone out, such as, for example, the Church of Cæsarea, in Palestine, as, again, that of Antioch, of Syria, and the Church of the city of Rome itself; since it has been handed down for the memory of posterity that the same Peter founded those Churches and all those around them; and thus even that of Egypt and Alexandria itself, although these not in person but by the medium of Mark his disciple, because at that time he was occupied in Italy and among the nations surrounding." I now continue the list of names:—Lucifer of Cagliari, Cyril of Jerusalem; the *Chronologies* of Bucher and Berne, of Palemio Silvio, Athanasius, the author of the *Synopsis*, so called, of Anastasius, the chronicle prefixed to the text of the letters of Athanasius, Julian the Apostate, Ephrem the Syrian, Pope Damaso, Optatus, Julius Pollux, Philastrio of Brescia, Ambrose of Milan, Gregory Nazianzen, Epiphanius, in

several places, Prudentius, Theodorus of Mopsuestia, Moses, James of Sarug, Abraham Mamiconensis, Nurcetes a Nestorian, Paulinus of Nola in many places, Eusebius of Alexandria, John Chrysostom, Jerome, in very many places, Augustin of Hippo, in very many places, Leo the Grand, and many others, down to Gregory the Great, who in whole or in part relate or indicate and allude to the residence of St. Peter in Rome. I wish to mention even Fathers who, very distant from the language and the place, and also sometimes from the religious sentiments of Rome,—for they were not all Catholics,—have confessed this fact.

Behold the multitude and the grandeur of these critical witnesses who can be brought forward for this historical fact, visible to the eyes of all, without need that it should be authenticated by a particular revelation of the arrival of St. Peter in Rome.

And hence we should demand proofs to the contrary from whoever says that he never was here, and they would be well received by us if they were authoritative.

We should be silent if, for instance, the Scriptures said that Peter died elsewhere, since it is the point of his death that is the greatest and the most solemn in this our question, even if in the Scriptures there was a command to Peter not to come to Rome, or at all events a prophecy. We have many other facts also visible of which the Scriptures assure us, independently of the dogmatic value which its word may possess. Instead of authoritative proofs, two sole arguments are opposed to us. The one is that which in the schools is called “the argument of silence,” and is founded on the silence which in this respect the Scriptures preserve; the other is the argument of chronological difficulty. But gently! The first already we know. We ought to believe that which Holy Scripture says, but we are not obliged to believe nothing on which Holy Scripture is silent, even with regard to historic facts. (Movement.)

Let us allow for a moment that it may be said by our opponents according to their sentiments, “This is not dogma; the coming of Peter to Rome is not dogma,” and we should reply that it is an historic fact. Silence is a negative argument, and I should repeat, as I have said to our opponent, the argument of silence has so often been adduced, or rather, it is not necessary to say it when there are positive arguments of such numbers and of such force contrary to this silence. The argument of chronology which

is opposed is not, however, drawn from Scripture. Then what is it that is opposed to us?

Whoever would avail himself of this argument must commence by adopting the opinion of Signor Ellendorf; he must commence by saying that it is commonly received, that in such a year this fact has happened, and in such a year such another fact has happened. But the Scripture does not give us a chronology; and are we to fabricate it? (Movement.)

The President.—Gentlemen, we pray you to keep silence.

Fabiani.—Then doubts and difficulties may arise from our bad interpretation. If we wish to construct any chronology whatever, we must first of all take for our basis facts that are absolute and certain, facts that are well known; and if the scheme of chronology we should construct upon the words of Scripture should not include these certified facts, it would not be the error of Scripture, but our error. Every year the Protestants reconstruct those chronologies from the Scripture; but they have never been able, and they never will be able, to put themselves in accord one with another! What are the certainties, I do not say of the coming of St. Peter, but of the coming of St. Paul to Rome? That St. Paul did come to Rome the Scripture says; St. Luke says it; his own letters say it. Thus to an unbeliever, even to an unbeliever who did not recognise either the Scripture or revelation, not merely to an evangelical Protestant or to a Catholic, who both venerate the Scripture as the Word of God, this fact is so clear and certain that it could not be denied. There have been barely one or two men, the maddest among the Rationalists,—I do not remember if it is Mayer or Strauss,—who, wishing to deny the arrival of St. Paul in Rome, had to deny the genuineness of the Acts, and to say that the letters of St. Paul were not his, and such other follies, to which no one gave heed, and they have found no followers.

Now this fact of St. Paul, this clear, this luminous fact of his coming to Rome, which is the foundation of all that chronology which has been opposed to us, when did it take place? In what year? Who can say?

Eusebius makes him arrive in the year 55. (He reads from his own book, "*Notizie di Simon Mago. Roma, 1868.*") Excuse this book, which has been published now for many years; and so additions might be made to what I am reading. Eusebius in 55, Bengel and Sepp in 56, Jerome, Baronius, Capello in 57. He came in 58 according to Patrizi, in the year 60 according to Bas-

nage, Vogel, and Kuhnoel, in 61 according to Conybeare and Howson, Pearson, Spanhemio, Tillemont, Bertholdt, Feilmoser, Winer, Wurm, Anger, Wieseler. For 62 are Hug, Schmid, Schrader, Hensen, Schotz. For 63 Usher, Michaelis, Heinrichs, Eichhorn.

But when all the chronologies, according to the authors cited by me, are in such uncertainty, how can you by chronology come to argue against a fact so universally attested by so many witnesses? And what! was St. Peter a bronze statue, so that Catholics are bound to believe that, once come to Rome, he must stay there, nailed up, and could not move? What difficulty was there for him to go and come from one country to another, in the same manner as St. Paul did, itinerating from Church to Church, ruling Rome, and nevertheless being found now in Antioch, now in Jerusalem, now in some other place where he wished to be, or where he might have been called by the Holy Spirit?

How many days were necessary, for example, to come from Cæsarea to Rome? Little more than fifteen days. There were no steamers, as you know; there were no railways, it is true; but, in the grand and immense commerce which the human race then held with Rome the opportunities of going and coming were very frequent,—were daily.

Finally, very learned men among the Protestants, the most deeply studied in the same age, the most skilled in what regards the maritime art,—Smith and Penrose,—have calculated from the voyage of St. Paul himself, and from the narratives found in the Acts, the time which ships employed to come from Cæsarea to Rome. They sailed seven knots an hour, by which one hundred and seventy-seven hours or seven days and one-third were required to come from Cæsarea to Puteoli; and thus Pliny himself assures us that he came from Alexandria to Puteoli in nine days; from Alexandria in Egypt in nine days, and in seven days from Alexandria to Messina. Cæsarea and Jerusalem, you know, are at a distance from Rome little different from that of Alexandria in Egypt. From Messina and Puteoli in two or three days they came to Rome. Thus the journey from Rome to Palestine did not occupy more than the half of a month; and even if Peter had gone to Babylon sometimes, this journey, six hundred miles, or thereabouts,—much longer as a journey than that which carried him to Rome, because to Rome they came by sea, and much more quickly, and the journey to Babylon must have been made by caravans, which did not travel

more than fifteen or twenty miles a day,—I say that this journey would not have occupied more than a couple of months.

And here I am asked, why St. Peter sometimes appears in this place and in that, and why he remains in the East? and hence it is said that chronology does not give the time for him to come in, while, if I have not ill understood, in this chronology we suddenly passed from the year 45 to the year 56, without rendering an account of the interval. Leaving on one side this chronology of Ellendorf, of Michaelis, and of others, if even there was a chronology to which no objection could be raised; had a chronology actually been framed in which we could confide, which had all the veritable elements of time and place, and made all these accord together, then this difficulty might arise. But if in this system of chronology it proved impossible to introduce an event so well known, so certain as the coming of St. Peter to Rome, this alone would make that chronology false, because chronology is based upon facts certified in history, before it can walk alone.

And, I say to my opponents, you do not consider that besides the Catholics, who with you seek and really desire to find the truth, you have other enemies, you have the infidels and the rationalists, who study the Scriptures not to draw thence some profit to their souls, not there to find the truth, but to destroy it, to annihilate it.

Do you know what these would say to you, had we come to this hard conclusion that the chronology of Scripture, not that constructed by us on certain Scriptural data, but the chronology of Scripture, did altogether exclude the coming of St. Peter to Rome? They do not receive the Scripture as a Divine word: they would say that of the coming of St. Peter to Rome there are hundreds and hundreds of witnesses, that he who said that after fourteen years he came to Rome (*sic*) is but Paul alone, and that against so many witnesses the word and authority of Paul do not avail, and they would employ this argument against you:—

I have completed one-and-forty years; (permit that for a moment I speak of myself, not to introduce the person of a man into this sacred discussion upon the Word of God;) but I have completed forty-one years since I began to study the numbers found in Divine Scripture, to study this Scriptural chronology, and two years have not yet passed since I ventured to submit to public view the result of these very long labours, not yet terminated. The discovery of the long series of Assyrian inscriptions, namely,

those of the rulers of Assyria which have lately been found in cuneiform writing, offered to me the opportunity ; these discoveries gave me an occasion for publishing the result of studies concerning that part of Scriptural chronology. A name revered among the learned, Dr. Richard Lepsius, whom many of you will have heard of, as in our day the patriarch of studies in oriental chronology, said in 1860 that since the discovery of this series of Assyrian inscriptions Scriptural chronology was dead, and that henceforth it was useless to attempt to reconcile the words of the sacred books of Kings with these monuments newly come forth to light.

There were illustrious men, Dr. Oppert, De Saulci, and others, who endeavoured to reply. I also tried : I know not whether I hit the mark, but certainly what I had to say was different enough from all that had before been said in Scriptural chronology.

Ah ! perhaps, had one of my opponents given a few hours to these studies, and toiled, as one must toil at those ciphers before being able to frame any solution in the very least degree creditable or trustworthy, he would not speak with such want of reserve of Scriptural chronology. And here let us not argue as to the chronology of St. Peter, which our opponent has compared to his chronology taken from Scripture, let us not argue as to his arrival in Rome ; a single day, I repeat, spent by St. Peter in Rome gives the victory to the Thesis we defend.

As to the twenty-five years, our opponent has said that among Catholics themselves, by one they are understood in one way, by another in a different one. This is not the point of the question ; every one has his chronology, because from the words of Scripture they can draw hundreds and hundreds, Catholics and Protestants.

Yes, I repeat, this is not the point of our question. We must see if St. Peter has been in Rome, since, if he has been a single day, it is false to say that he never came.

Finally, as to certain points indicated by our opponent, we wish only to make a slight addition, a little observation.

We shall speak first of the intellectual quality of Papias, if we do not, indeed, at another time return to that subject.

It is true that Papias was not a man of much talent ; but he was exceedingly desirous and eager to know what had been done by the Apostles and disciples of our Lord. With this view, according to Eusebius, he undertook many voyages, and spent a great part of his life. And then his not being of lively talent was a reason why

he was held to the repetition of what he heard, without making additions. Repeating others, he could not himself invent. When it is a question of his opinions in his mode of understanding scientific subjects, he could easily fall into error, in fact did fall into the error of taking in a material sense expressions concerning the kingdom of Christ, and of believing that the whole host of the saints of the Lord should reign for a thousand years amid balls and feastings, in a perpetual carnival, (hilarity,) ill interpreting, because not of strong mind, the words regarding the future kingdom of Christ in Paradise. But in repeating a historical fact which he had heard he had no need of peculiar talent, or a great intellect. So apparently (yet this is a question of criticism which we should leave on one side, but which it is well to indicate) so apparently with regard to the words of Ignatius, whatever be their value.

Remember that the Epistles of St. Ignatius have come down to us in many forms, and it is not certain that the longest or the shortest are absolutely the most veritable and genuine, as it is not known who may perhaps have made additions and comments; and who on the other hand wished only to have a compendium. However, it must be noted that the words which contain the allusion made by Ignatius to the Apostles Peter and Paul are found in all the versions of the Epistles of St. Ignatius, not excepting the Syriac translation, which is the briefest, and which, not long since, was published by the learned and erudite Tischendorf; so that among critics there is no room whatever for doubt, as to the genuineness of these words, upon which a question might be raised.

In the conclusion, he wished to regard as absolutely absurd the opinion of those who think that Babylon might be a fictitious name for Rome, as a symbol used before the days of Christians who considered the prophecies of Isaiah, of Micah, and other prophets who wrote, menacing Babylon, as referring to Rome; and afterwards this letter of Peter, and afterwards the Apocalypse and the letters of St. Paul.

My learned opponent has wished almost to treat, as absolutely absurd, this opinion which regards Babylon as a *nom de guerre* representing Rome, and he has told us that Signor Michaelis, a fair and bright name, but after all, one who wrote some time ago, that is, at the end of the last century, has taken this point as altogether settled.

I do not wish to enter into a particular discussion of this question, although my opponent has confessed that all the tradition of the

best ancient interpreters, or nearly all, is on our side. However, I believe that doubt exists as to what has been said, that in the East the ancients thought otherwise, because a single ancient author, Cosmo Indicopleustes, a native of Egypt, who passed through the East and went round by Cæsarea, has maintained that the Babylon of this Epistle of St. Peter was the Babylon of Chaldea. There was also some other author later in the twelfth century, or the thirteenth or fourteenth; but this cannot be called tradition of the ancients to be opposed to that of St. Jerome and the others who have been named by my opponent, and yet others who could be named, who have said that Babylon was Rome. And these more recent authors besides did not deny, that if Peter had been at Babylon, he also had been in Rome.

Not to unduly lengthen this part of the debate, I shall bring only the testimony of one very recent author, greatly to be respected among the number of the non-Catholics, who commenced to print his commentary upon this letter of St. Peter and upon the Catholic Epistles in 1870, which was not published till 1871, by reason, I believe, of the war that interrupted his labours; and this is a name of the greatest reputation among Protestant writers, and the senior, I believe, of all the interpreters of Germany,—Ewald. Now he has admitted, in this work of his, of last year, that Babylon means Rome, and that from Rome this letter was written by Peter himself. The proofs, therefore, of Clarke and Michaelis are not quite as strong as they were taken to be by our opponent, since not only the Catholics, but non-Catholic writers themselves, are not at the present day ready to admit them; and Ewald calls the opinion that does not * recognise Rome,—an opinion without foundation.

If I do not mistake, he says *ganz grundlose*. Now he does not rest upon the argument of tradition, but on arguments concerning this Epistle. I speak of his opinion; I do not intend to make his judgment mine; but to the authority brought forward, that of Michaelis and Clarke, I oppose an authority which I believe worthy of greater respect, because he was able to see and to weigh that which Michaelis (a great name he also) had said, and able, also, to avail himself of new studies still more recent. It is the name of Heinrich Ewald. I think that his learning and his critical skill is of the utmost weight. Now he employs geographical

* The original reads:—"Una opinione senza nessun fondamento quella che vi riconosce Roma." The argument requires a "non" before "riconosce," and I have translated accordingly.

arguments, and says a letter written from Babylon, for example, would not first of all arrive at Pontus, then at Galatia, and afterwards at Cappadocia, and Asia, and Bithynia. Quite the contrary. Coming from Babylon, it must have first arrived in Cappadocia, afterwards at Pontus, on the other side Asia, and finally at Galatia and Bithynia. There were continually travellers, who from Rome went by sea, and perhaps these were brought from Pontus by vessels laden with tunny fish for Rome, and by them returned thither; and it was they who carried these letters. On the sea-shore lay Pontus; afterwards from Pontus the way to Babylon lay across Cappadocia, and on this account it came second in the superscription, and the same may be said of the others, which provinces were thus related in this superscription, as they were related to the route along which these letters must be distributed from Pontus to the other places. He adds many other reasons to show that in all these letters Peter speaks properly according to the sentiments which made him judge and arbiter, as we say, among those who wished to destroy too much of the ancient doctrines, and those who wished to conserve too much. He adds many other things. He says, "Remark that Peter speaks of a persecution which commenced and which threatened equally him who wrote and those who were in Pontus and Asia, Bithynia and Cappadocia. Now if this is very clear, it shows that it was the persecution that Nero the Roman Emperor waged." Now, had he been in Babylon, he would not have been subject to this persecution, because Babylon did not belong to the Roman empire; and he would have been free; he would have been entirely separated from it: and I repeat I do not bring my opinion. I oppose the word of a non-Catholic of the highest respectability, I oppose a recent and modern decision to an authority that has been brought forward. But then, my dear Gentlemen, you see at a glance what small and miserable points they are which they would set in opposition to a great fact, which is the foundation of the whole Church, not only for us, but for all, even for our opponents, because if Peter came to Rome, then you know that for all those whom Christ has called, it is necessary to obey the voice of the successors of the Apostle, necessary for all the men whom Jesus has come to redeem.

But do you not see this event so shining, so interesting, so fully attested by an immense multitude of witnesses of every century, of every time, and every opinion, in which are united ancient heretics and ancient Catholics, the learned with the unlearned, the

East with the West, the Pontiffs with heads of schisms, with Patriarchs of the other Churches, with those Churches which separated themselves from Rome ; an event which has been represented by painters, by sculptors, by artists ; an event in which all men, we may say, who lived in the Christian religion for so many ages, recognised the foundation of their faith as that which enabled the hierarchy to rule over them, and gave it a dominion which many called even tyrannical ? is an event thus known, to be opposed upon a question of a year more or a year less, according to the opinion of Michaelis or of Ellendorf ?

In conclusion, not to forget anything of what has been intimated, it was said that St. Peter and St. Paul had diverse missions. It is true Peter was designated to preach to the circumcised ; and thus he calls himself the Apostle of the Circumcision ; Paul for the Gentiles. Therefore it is said, Peter did not come to Rome. Then in Rome were there no circumcised ? In Rome were there no Hebrews ? Do I not remember Cicero, in his speech *Pro Flacco*, says, “ I must speak now of the gold Flaccus has hindered from being carried into Judæa ; and I must speak in a low voice, lest these Jews make tumults and uproar ? ” They were then so powerful, —although the Jewish colony had only a few years ago begun to come to Rome,—they were so powerful as to frighten Cicero, and to make him speak with bated breath. The Jews were protected by Cæsar, and afterwards by Augustus. And have we not, in a number of Latin poets, a remembrance of the *Trigesima Sabatha* ? one poet, who says, *solas deducere verpas*—to show the road only to the circumcised, and to no others ? And then, does not Josephus tell us how great was the power of these Hebrews in Rome up to the moment that Poppæa Sabina, a Hebrew proselyte, sat by the side of Nero ? And Paul, does he not tell us that there were Hebrews in Rome ? those who remained hardened in Judaism, those who were dissentients ? Were not these, also, a part of the Hebrews to whom, with every right, Peter would have preached the Gospel ? among whom he would, with every right, have exercised his apostleship ? Indeed, this formed an evidence, a strength of the same fact. Ah, I believe that, ere one would combat a fact so serious, so solemn, by the silence of the Bible, by negative arguments, by little difficulties of chronology constructed by ourselves, —before we should combat with these, we should need the strength of other opposing proofs capable of destroying this universality and notoriety of the event ; the ample confession of so many

writers and of so many ages which attest the coming of St. Peter to Rome.

Ribetti.—Gentlemen, I am sorry that I cannot say, like my honourable opponent, that I have studied the question forty years ; because I am not yet so old. Nevertheless, I have given some study to the question now under discussion. I do not ask you to receive my words as infallible ; I only ask you to hear my argument ; to hold it fast, if it be good ; to reject it, if it be bad.

My opponent commenced by saying that my colleague had wandered from the theme. On the contrary, my colleague went direct to the point, and has proved, by the only real proofs,—that is, by Holy Scripture, which even our opponents are constrained to respect,—that St. Peter did not come to Rome. Our opponents, like learned men as they are, know what has been written for centuries against the Church of Rome ; and they have the habit of saying to their hearers, who (I may say this without offending any one) do not understand these matters, “They are the old objections ; it is the old story ;” *solite cose*. And when a Roman theologian has said, “The old thing, the old story,” a good Roman Catholic ought to bow his head before the ecclesiastical authority, and ought to say, “It is all settled ; it is all concluded.” But we that do not so easily bow the head ; we, the children of free inquiry and of the Holy Scriptures, open our eyes, and wish to see for ourselves before we believe.

Our honourable opponent said that my colleague had made distinctions as to the circumstances, the manner, and the duration of the coming of St. Peter in Rome. Shall we have such distinctions ? Let them be made, by all means ; only let us make a little observation. By the confession of our opponents, or, to speak more accurately, of our opponent, they are content if they can prove, just as two and two make four, that Peter came even for one hour to Rome. But the pontificate of twenty-five years ? Then that remains a point gained for debate, and it is of no moment, whether Peter was here during twenty-five years.

Fabiani.—A moment. To the question ! Here we do not consider the time that he was in Rome, but whether St. Peter ever was in Rome. The Thesis does not speak of twenty-five years.

President Tosti.—Let the Thesis be kept in mind, that Signor Sciarelli would deliver a public lecture, in which he would show, by arguments drawn from the Bible and the holy Fathers, that St. Peter never was in Rome.

Ribetti.—Starting from this point, I would observe that my opponent was not called to order when he entered upon this question. Distinguishing between the facts, he said the facts are proved historically, and, in a certain class of ideas, those proofs are sufficient. Then there are spiritual things for which the authority of the Church is necessary; and here there is no question of the authority of the Church, but of the coming of St. Peter to Rome. And, as our opponent went away from the question, perhaps I, also, may be permitted to do so. I do not wish to treat—(Interruption).

President.—Proceed; but I pray you to confine yourself to the terms of the question.

Ribetti.—I must follow my opponent. My opponent has carried me over diversified ground, and I am constrained to follow him, not to allow him to hide anywhere. We are dealing with a simple fact, that of the arrival of the Apostle Peter in Rome. With this the idea of supremacy, cleverly insinuated by our opponent, has nothing to do. He has spoken of mysterious things, and I say, looking to the fact, that the arrival of St. Peter is not a mysterious thing which must be proved by the authority of the Church; it is not a matter to be manipulated in places into which I cannot enter. Were it so, not entering into the domain of general history, it would not be a fact purely historical; and this is the most evident condemnation of the argumentation of my opponent, since, if the arrival of St. Peter in Rome is mysterious, that means that I, an enemy of mystery, one who studies history simply, cannot enter into this matter, and by consequence not being able ever to have proof, I must submit myself to the authority of the Church. I understand: this is what is meant; but it is precisely that which I do not mean; since I wish to destroy the foundation of the Roman edifice by demonstrating historically, that it is impossible to prove that St. Peter has been in Rome. We say that the Roman edifice was not built either by Jesus Christ or by His Apostles; but as our opponent very well said, there were first of all insinuations (understand?) as when a person writes a letter to a friend. The fact is not explained, because it is a fact known. This is an insinuation, as many have been thrown out in past ages, as the conception was insinuated. A little at a time the insinuation becomes an explanation, which eventually becomes a decree. (Movement.) But, dear Gentlemen, this is to the question. They are insinuations. In fact, they did not dare to say that in the first Fathers of the Church are to be

found any declarations, but they say that there are insinuations, and it is precisely for this that in historical matters we are enemies of insinuations; and did a historian fall into one's hand that proceeded by insinuation, I do not care to say, my dear Gentlemen, how I should look upon him; but certainly I should have no confidence whatever in an historian who would proceed not by facts, but by insinuations; since he would go on amplifying insinuations, till what at the beginning no one could take for facts, by passing from hand to hand, and finding a prepared soil, gain a footing; but they are always insinuations. It is precisely here that the Church of Rome is weak. She must always labour with difficulty to take root, and where she succeeds she developes, becomes a tree, and spreads around. She claims to imitate the grain of mustard seed in the parable of Christ, which stretches forth its branches under which the beasts of the field take shelter, and in which the birds of the air build their nests, and she pretends to the empire of the world. She has always to proceed in this manner, and especially to establish her principal dogma on which the whole edifice rests, that is, the coming and the primacy of St. Peter in Rome. She always proceeded thus with pious insinuations. They say Papias has made an insinuation, and then the others have taken courage, quoting insinuations; afterwards came Ignatius, and made an insinuation; Clement of Rome came, and he made insinuations. You are free, if you please, to admit, as you do admit, my dear Gentlemen, a system of insinuations. I should not admit it certainly; therefore I repeat that they must prove to us with historical facts which cannot be destroyed, that the fact of the coming of the Apostle St. Peter to Rome was asserted by ocular and contemporaneous witnesses. How is it possible, my dear Gentlemen, that the capital fact in the history of Roman Catholicism is received by Roman Catholics through insinuations? Ah, this is the same as would be attempting to raise the edifice of the Church on the point of a needle, since much less than the point of a needle is an insinuation. Give me a positive assertion of St. John, St. Paul, or St. Luke; give me even a single word of St. Peter that says, "I have been in Rome;" I bow my head and say, "He did come to Rome." But if you do not find in the Scriptures or contemporary witnesses, if you do not find in the Bible, the supreme judge and incontrovertible authority, a proof of St. Peter's arrival in Rome, you have proved nothing at all.

They have quoted the Fathers of the Church, commenced my opponent; and that what he advanced might not be feeble, he began with the fourth century, from authors who no longer made insinuations, because they had received it, and by consequence say, It is true. Why? Because the thing was already well insinuated. So commencing with Optatus, afterwards Irenæus, he comes further down and speaks to us of Tertullian, of Cyprian, and of others, who lived in the year 200, in 250, in 300, and consequently are not ocular witnesses, and have no authority, since they have amplified an insinuation which cannot be considered as a fact. Afterwards he went on to speak of one worthy of greater respect, of Clement of Rome.

It is not necessary that I should confute my opponent on this point, since he himself has not asserted that Clement said that St. Peter did come to Rome, and, in fact, the assertion does not exist. Clement of Rome speaks in general of the ancient martyrs anterior to his time, and speaking of the martyrs he points to the martyrdom of St. Peter as to the martyrdom of St. Paul. Indeed he speaks much more of St. Paul than of St. Peter; a thing incredible this for a Bishop of Rome who, if in his time he had believed himself to be Pope of the universal Church founded upon the see of St. Peter, would have been bound to make much of the supremacy of Peter, and not to occupy himself so much with St. Paul, leaving Peter in the shade. Quite the contrary was done by the Father St. Clement, which signifies that in his time he did not even dream of the insinuations whereof they have spoken to us.

At last they spoke of the Apostle John, saying that he asserted that St. Peter died in Rome. Gentlemen, I should be exceedingly fortunate if any one should show me this proof. Many times as I have read the Apostle St. John I have never been able to see it; and as a doubt begins to rise in my mind that I may be blind, I should be pleased that any one should open my eyes, and let me see the passage where he says that St. Peter came to Rome. But this passage does not exist. Would you have it that St. John also has insinuated? He has not insinuated anything. He narrates simply that when Peter had been re-established in his apostleship after his repentance, after his tears, the Lord demanded of him three times, "Lovest thou Me more than these?" hurting the *amour-propre* of the Apostle. The Apostle, hearing Christ three times put to him the same question, was afflicted, and he thought that He took him

for a coward, and said, "Thou knowest that I love Thee;" but he did not say, "More than these," because he had denied Jesus Christ. Well, then, Jesus Christ said to him, "A moment will come in which another shall bind thee, and will carry thee whither thou wouldest not." Now I do not see that this is a proof of his death in Rome. Without doubt he died; without doubt he was a martyr; but if you can read the name of Rome in these words of Christ, I admire your clearsightedness.

My opponent has spoken of all the Fathers who have maintained that St. Peter was in Rome. He has given us a very long list of names. I do not know what end this list can serve, for once an insinuation has grown up in the mind as insinuations do grow up, once it has become an incontrovertible fact, all the authors accept it, and repeat it, because, as takes place in this world, we do repeat one another. The child repeats what he has heard from the father, we repeat that we have heard said by our predecessors, and if we do not accurately study we shall always live in our prejudices; and what is civilization, if not a constant struggle against prejudice? We ought hence to combat it wherever we find it.

Do you think that an ancient error has a right to be accepted by our mind? But the ancient error ought to be banished more speedily than a new one, because it has done more harm. Then this is a very ancient error which penetrated into the heart of man, and the most distinguished men in the Middle Ages, all said on the faith of ancient authors that Peter came to Rome. I know it well; but, Gentlemen, this proves not at all that Peter did come, because the antiquity of an error cannot transform it into truth. Besides, do you think that there is any prescription for things which are not true, which are not just? There is no prescription before God. There may be before human tribunals, but not before the tribunal of the Lord. Then, if it is an ancient error, it is an error also now, only for many centuries it was not recognised. Here we should have to enter into a discussion as to the testimony of the Fathers, and I confess that I pity the auditory, as that discussion would be rather long.

We must say something further concerning Papias. Papias is considered by Eusebius as a propagator of fables. Now, do you wish to believe in the fables narrated by Papias? As my opponent himself has said to you, Papias believed that the recompense of Christians would be a carnival without end. But, my dear Gentle-

men, a Minister of Christ who for eternal recompense promises a carnival, scandalizes me. I am sorry, but I cannot have faith in this Papias, who makes promises so fine and so spiritual, that they remind one a little of those of Mohammed, who, to his followers, promised also a species of carnival,—promised houris. Besides, where are the writings of Papias? They do not exist. Only some quotations from them are found in those of Eusebius. Further, Did Papias really say that St. Peter was in Rome? No. Our opponent has not been able to cite a passage where Papias said that St. Peter came to Rome.

Dionysius has been cited; but Dionysius complained even in his own time of the falsification of his works. He said that they had spoiled them. Besides, where does Dionysius say that Peter came to Rome? When I should see a passage cited, I might discuss it, but it was not cited. Dionysius says that they have interpolated many things into his writings, that they have falsified them, which was very easy in the times when printing did not exist, and an author did not put forth editions of his works by thousands of copies, accurately revised and corrected by himself. Then, when an author published a book, it was transcribed by copyists, and one introduced one thing and another another. It is in this mode, Gentlemen, that tradition was falsified, a thing which can be proved if we have further conferences with our honourable opponents.

Irenæus has been quoted; but Irenæus lived at the end of the second or the beginning of the third century: hence, he was not an eye-witness. He could not say that he had seen. Take care. When religion is in question, I listen willingly to those who, like St. John, say to me, "The things that we have seen with our eyes, the things that we have handled, declare we unto you;" but if any one wishes to take into his hands the direction of my soul, relying upon uncertain traditions, I say, that my soul is too valuable for me to give it up into his hands. (Movement.) I believe St. John, because St. John speaks to me of Christ with authority, because he says, "I have seen;" "I have touched." Thus I believe the Apostles, but I cannot put my faith in this Irenæus. Should I examine the observations of my opponent relative to the Fathers of the Church who wrote upon the same subject in times very much posterior to the facts asserted, there would be much matter to unfold, which frightens me, but this would carry me very far, and I fear would drive my audience away. Our opponent,

not being able to produce proof that Peter ever was in Rome, beyond an insinuation which afterwards transformed itself into a fact, according to his view, he comes back, and demands of us proof that he has not been here. There is a Father of the Church who was called Clement of Rome, who has written a certain letter to the Corinthians, where he speaks of the Arabian phoenix. "That it exists, every one says; where it is, no one knows." It is, then, a father of the Church that has spread this fable. The phoenix is a marvellous bird covered with brilliant feathers of gold and purple, lives five hundred years, and after this time dies. Then a worm springs from the body of the phoenix, which worm becomes feathered, the feathers grow, and the worm becomes the Arabian phoenix. On this account it is said that this bird rises from its ashes. Thus Clement of Rome, the Pope, teaches. Do you believe in the Arabian phoenix? I do not. Then even you see that these Fathers make mistakes in such an extraordinary way that they can receive for truth the fable of the phoenix. I cannot. Nevertheless, Clement of Rome was one of those Fathers that lived shortly after the apostolic generation, and he had known the Apostle St. Paul, since he was rather the disciple of St. Paul than of the Apostle St. Peter. But if my opponent says to me, "Prove that the phoenix does not exist," (since a good Catholic ought to believe what a Pope has written,) "till you prove to me that there is not an Arabian phoenix, I shall believe that there is," I will answer to him, "But how do you imagine that I can prove to you that the phoenix does not exist?" I cannot prove it; and if you should show it to me, I should ask if it was embalmed, or if it was living.

Well, Gentlemen, there is a fact in history which for me is the Arabian phoenix, and it is the arrival of St. Peter in Rome. His arrival cannot be proved, and I cannot in a mathematical way prove that he never did come; but I ask you, find me an author who says that he did come to Rome, and that he died there, and an author in whom I can put confidence. This proof they cannot produce, because it does not exist, consequently they are constrained to ask us to prove a thing which is sufficiently proved, because it is clear that zero multiplied by zero makes zero. In fact, when there are no witnesses that prove that a fact is true, the fact is not true. Now, says our opponent, although there is a silence very significant in the first centuries as to the coming of St. Peter to Rome, even

a fact on which silence is maintained may be believed. Anything can be done ; one can believe anything that one wishes ; but our business is to know if we can believe with reason. Now, this is what no one can with reason believe, namely, that Peter came or that Peter died in Rome, when this fact is not proved, and he that would believe it would place himself in the power of superstition, and would pass for one without sense.

We should now enter into the intricate labyrinth of chronology, but I do not mean to do it ; (movement ;) all the more because I find myself in the presence of an opponent who has studied it for forty years, while I have studied it much less ; on which account his assertions ought to be much more authoritative than mine ; but let him be kind enough to present us with his chronology, since he has not given it, and we shall see if his chronology will stand in accord with the facts narrated in the Holy Scripture ; and if he will show me a scheme of chronology adapted to the Scripture itself, then, I say, he is right. But it is not sufficient for me that he tells me that he is more learned in chronology than I and my colleagues can be. We are not convinced so easily. We wish proofs, Gentlemen ; and without proofs we do not believe anything, and ye have not any. (Movement.)

It is true that our opponent says that we Protestants should go over to the Rationalists, who have gone as far as denying that which is written in the Bible, even the coming of St. Paul to Rome. He may cite authors if he wishes. I do not take the trouble to verify his quotations, because it does not concern me in the least. The Church of Rome one day had in the seminary of St. Sulpice in Paris a young alumnus of considerable distinction called Rénan. He was a good Roman Catholic. What has Rénan become now ? If I should hold my opponents responsible for the opinions of Rénan, they would have cause to say that I was not a reasonable man. So, when they speak to me of Protestant Rationalists, I reply, that I have nothing to do with them, as you have nothing to do with Voltaire and Rénan. Then let us set that question aside.

Our adversary says that the dates are variable ; that every one fixes them by caprice. It may be so ; but reasonable men do not act thus. We accurately study, and we endeavour to fix the dates according to the best possible criteria. Thus do all the non-Catholics of the great nations which have separated from Rome ; and they are not the furthest behind in civilisation. We do not

lay our reason aside, but we study and investigate things. We cannot do anything more, and be assured that, when we have done what we can for the discovery of the truth, we have our consciences at rest.

I know that they may say to me, "No, it is not true; you cannot have your conscience tranquil, because you must know that Peter has been in Rome. We tell you so, and you ought to believe." Stay! I say. Believe in you? No. I believe in good, solid arguments; and, as you have them not, I do not believe in you.

It is very true that for them it is sufficient to believe; yield, commit yourself into their hands, leaving yourself to be led by their knowledge through the most intricate questions, because they have the infallible authority. (Movement.) But I do not believe in this infallible authority. Permit me to say so; and, consequently, I am forced to return to my criterion which is not infallible; in which, however, one can confide, because I do not allow anything important to escape me; or at least what appears to me important, since I cannot have a blind faith.

Our opponent has spoken of another question very interesting; that is, whether St. Peter wrote his Epistle to the Hebrews of the Dispersion from Babylon or from Rome. My opponent maintains that the two letters were written from Rome. I maintain, on the contrary, that they were written from Babylon. And in fact, on what do they rely to prove that the Babylon of St. Peter is Rome? They rely—he has not said it, but I know it well—they rely upon the Apocalypse. (*A voice.*—He said it.)

Ribetti.—Ah, he said it; so much the better. I beg pardon.

(*Voices from the bench of the Roman Catholic Priests.*—No, no.)

Ribetti.—Well, let us admit for a moment that the opponent was right. What would be the consequence? The consequence would be that Rome is that great Babylon which is anathematized by the Word of God, that great Babylon which has caused all the hurt done in the Church of our Saviour Jesus Christ. It would result that the Church of Rome is truly the persecuting Church spoken of in the Apocalypse: it would result that the Apostle St. John, employing in his writings divers metaphors, calls the Church of Rome that woman who was seated upon the beast, which is generally interpreted to mean the worldly power, calls her the woman who has apostatized from the verity of the Gospel. I do not go further. It was just needful that I should intimate, if we admitted

the hypothesis of my opponent, namely, that Babylon may be Rome, the consequence that would flow from it. But no, nothing of all this. When St. John wrote the Apocalypse, he wrote a book of a nature different from the Epistles of St. Peter. In fact, what do you find in the Apocalypse? Visions. You there find lofty metaphor, you there find figures from the beginning to the end. Is this the epistolary style? Very different. If you received a letter of a similar kind, you would throw it away, because it is not thus that letters are written. Letters are written in a sober style, allegories are not employed in them, or visions, &c. Now precisely thus wrote St. Peter. Laying aside visions and allegories, he wrote to his dear Hebrew brethren dispersed in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, and Cappadocia, and he gave them his counsel and his instructions. With the greatest simplicity he said that he wrote from Babylon. What would you say if some one, as my colleague observed, writing from Florence, which is accustomed to call itself the Athens of Italy, under date of the year 1872, instead of writing "Florence," such a day of such a month, should write "Athens?" You would laugh, and you would say it was silliness. Now, the Apostle St. Peter would not commit such a puerility; therefore, when he said that he wrote from Babylon, it is evident that he did write from Babylon. Who can say that Babylon no longer existed at that time, as certain individuals erroneously hold? But our opponent has not said this. He did not say that Babylon did not exist at that time, because Babylon did exist, and the proofs are found in Philo, in Josephus Flavius, and in many other authors. Then it existed.

It will be said to me that it was no longer the ancient splendid Babylon in which many myriads of Israelites lived. Now it was precisely this city, where were found not few Israelites, as is said of Rome, but myriads; for it was a centre of many provinces where dispersed Israelites dwelt: that was the natural place for the Apostle of the circumcision. Our opponents do not deny that St. Peter was the Apostle of the circumcision, because this is clearly indicated in sacred writ, and they are constrained to admit it. It is of no avail saying that in Rome there were many Hebrews. There are many now, but if any one said that he who wished to take charge of the Hebrews must establish himself at Rome, he would be told that he made a mistake, because the Hebrews are much more numerous in other cities than in Rome. If you say to me that St. Peter came to Rome, because this city was the capital

of the empire, I understand you ; but if you say he came as the Apostle of the Hebrews, because in Rome there were Hebrews, you cut the ground from under your own feet,—permit me the expression. In fact, if Peter came to Rome for the Hebrews, he was no longer the head of the universal Church, he was a pastor of the Hebrews. This is what is evident. But Peter did not come to Rome ; he was at Babylon. This is proved by the Epistles of Peter themselves, and in regard to this it is strange to see how our opponents put St. Peter in the wrong. Let them respect the authority of St. Peter, at least as they respect that of his successors. Moreover, I say that St. Peter was truly infallible, that he wrote under Divine direction : hence his letter dated from Babylon proves that truly he was in the city. With your rhetorical figures you would make me turn into smoke the best ascertained facts of history, and if we proceed with insinuations and metaphors, I do not know where we shall stop. Let us leave, therefore, metaphors and insinuations. When dealing with a letter written in a clear and simple style, let us stand by what it says, and let us not fantastically go after I know not what inventions. Let us hold, then, that the Apostle St. Peter was in Babylon, and without spending more time on this point, I shall pass to another.

My opponent has found an admirable proof to demonstrate that truly the Apostle St. Peter did not write from Babylon. He had recourse to a geographical one, saying that whoever leaves Rome first, finds Pontus, after that, Cappadocia, then Galatia, and next, Bithynia. Hence, St. Peter having enumerated these regions in this order, his letter must have come from Rome. Dear Gentlemen, permit me to tell you with all simplicity, this seems to be a puerile argument,—a cavil. When St. Peter was writing to the Hebrews dispersed in Galatia, Cappadocia, and Bithynia, what mattered it placing one of those regions foremost rather than another ? When Italy, Germany, and France are spoken of, perhaps we take great care to preserve the geographical order of these countries. No, since it is one of those questions which the French characterize by the adage *bonnet blanc, blanc bonnet*. (Laughter.) Hence I entirely reject the geographical proof presented by our opponent.

Our honourable opponent says that the Apostle St. Peter speaks of persecutions which were about to fall upon those to whom he wrote, and upon himself. Here our opponent thinks that he triumphs ; this according to him proves that St. Peter was not in Babylon, since that city was not in the Roman empire. He could

not fear for himself the persecutions which were preparing in the empire of Rome. At this day, when I hear the preaching of the Roman Catholics, what do I hear? I hear them speaking of persecutions in Rome, of persecutions out of Rome, of persecutions everywhere. But everywhere Victor Emmanuel does not reign, as everywhere did not reign the Emperor Nero. Notwithstanding this they speak in general of persecution. Very well. St. Peter also spoke of persecutions, and it does not matter to us that Babylon was not in the Roman empire. Let us admit that it was not. That matters nothing, as he could be persecuted out of the Roman empire, or on its frontier. Therefore this proof has not any force.

My opponent has said that he admitted the differing missions of the Apostles Peter and Paul. I am glad of it, because these differing missions being once admitted, we must not change them. Therefore St. Peter received from Christ the mission to preach to the Hebrews. Then he would preach to the Hebrews, and he would not be universal Pope of the Church; and the Apostle St. Paul, who received the special mission to preach to the Gentiles, and who called himself the Apostle of the Gentiles, ought to have come into the capital of the empire and of paganism. This he did, coming to Rome, and preaching here, while Peter the Apostle of the Hebrews lived and preached always in Jerusalem, Samaria, Babylonia, and Galatia, and in the countries where the greatest number of his co-nationalists, the Israelites, were found. He exactly fulfilled his mission in the east, and St. Paul exactly his in the west. There was a moment in which they separated, after the dispute that took place in Antioch. They went so far as to form a division, not of faith but of labour, and thus one laboured among the Gentiles, and the other among the Hebrews. Leave then Peter to his work, and do not take him from his mission to transform him into a Pope of the universal Church sitting in Rome.

You see that the base of the colossus of the Roman Church is a base of chalk, or, if you wish, as I have already said, it is a needle's point, because it rests in the beginning upon an insinuation received and amplified by the imagination of authors in the early centuries. In the Middle Ages, a time of the propagation of the greatest errors and prejudices, it became colossal. The Papal authority was set up, which, however, was not yet what it is to-day. A little while ago it was still further amplified; but already it had been insinuated that the Pope must be infallible; and thus

you see that the colossus altogether rests upon a base of clay. We have given a light stroke to this base of clay, and the colossus has crumbled. (Movement in the audience.)

However, our opponent has said, as a conclusion of his discourse, in which he thought that he had irrefragably proved that Peter came to Rome, If Peter did come to Rome, all ought to come and take refuge in Rome. He believes that the conclusion is logical; I do not. Why, suppose that Peter was in Rome; was here for twenty-five years, and not merely for an hour, as our opponent said, reducing twenty-five years to one hour,—I ask by what right a man will say to me, “You are to obey me as you would have obeyed Peter?” (Movement.) But here they tell me not to enter into that argument. Let us leave it till another time to treat it more at large and expressly. I conclude, then; and I say, for my part, I have no need whatever of Peter, or rather, of the successor of Peter. I have the Master of Paul and of Peter; I have Christ Himself for my Master; and, instead of receiving instruction at second hand, I receive it directly from Him who rules over me better than the successors of Peter. Instead of committing myself to fallible men, I commit myself to the infallible Christ; instead of entrusting that which is most precious, the salvation of my soul, into the hands of a man, I place it in the hands of Christ, who died upon the cross to save me and all those who believe in Him. (Noise and exclamations on the right.)

President Tosti.—Pardon me. I have prayed from the beginning this honourable audience to be pleased to keep silence; not to disapprove nor to approve. This is required by the character and nature of this discussion. I again pray you not to utter expressions of any sort. Do me this favour, if you wish that the discussion shall proceed with peace, respect, and tranquillity.

Ribetti.—I commit my eternal interests, the salvation and the peace of my soul, into the hands of one more potent than St. Peter, into the hands of Christ who died for me upon the cross. Saved by Him, you will understand how little matters to me a historical fact which cannot have any influence on my eternal future. Whether I believe or not that Peter came to Rome, no one can condemn me, because I recognise, with my opponents, that it is not a doctrine, but that it is merely a historical fact. Gentlemen, the religion of our Saviour Jesus Christ is not localized, it has not a capital, consequently in this world it has not a centre, like the Mosaic law, which had one in Jerusalem. God is a Spirit, infinite,

universal, and everywhere, and Christ my Saviour also is everywhere. Without coming to Rome let any one, wherever he may be, even in the most remote deserts, turn to Christ, to God; and from Him he will receive an answer, receive pardon, and that suffices.

The President calls on Signor Cipolla.

Cipolla.—(ADVERTISEMENT) *The speech of Signor Cipolla could not be caught by the stenographers from causes independent of their art. Hence it was agreed to admit the present brief summary given by Signor Cipolla himself, and which was found conformable to the exposition that he made vivâ voce on the evening of the 9th of February.)* He remarked in the first place that the opponent had not understood his colleague. He declared that the distinction between an historical fact and a fact that wears the nature of dogma was brought forward to clear the question which was being treated, and to show how and when a fact may be related to the Holy Bible, and to define the position that the actual question was merely an historical fact to be proved by the criteria and arguments of history, and not capable of being negatived from the Bible unless it said the contrary, for its naked silence does not suffice.

He pointed out a distinction between the words "allusion" and "insinuation." The first includes and especially denotes a fact referred to in the words of one who is speaking on another subject; the second may simply indicate a suggestion. Hence he blamed the opponent, because he had ill understood this word, on the lips of his colleague, and had afterwards ill applied it, as if to show that the belief of the coming of St. Peter to Rome sprang from talk and fables; and because he had attributed this system to the conduct of the Roman Catholic Church as to other truths. He declared that he had gone from the question, and had not answered.

He remarked on the number and variety of the testimonies adduced, that besides their having been coeval, as nearly as possible after the burning of the books, and these of great value, they all must be taken together by reason of the occasions on which they arose, so as to form almost a contemporaneous and perennial testimony; and thus even testimonies the most distant might have the force of those that were coeval, because the Fathers in speaking of the Church of Rome always referred to that fact, namely, that St. Peter had been there, without any one who had an opposing

interest having dared to deny it, not the jealous for love of country, not heretics, to escape the judgment of Rome. He remarked that this was an argument so strong that Basnage himself concluded, after having alleged the first authorities which we allege, that whoever denies their force more than denies the coming of St. Peter to Rome,—denies and ruins the whole of history.

He remarked that his colleague had adduced a passage in St. John upon the death of Peter, not as saying that Peter died in Rome, of which he had been wrongly accused by his opponent, but only as saying that his death was a noted one. Speaking of the testimonies in particular, and specially coeval ones, he adduced the words of St. Ignatius:—"The Apostles Peter and Paul command you;" and he remarked that this included the confession that Peter and Paul had been in Rome, without which, what he said would be void of sense. This, he said, is a true allusion, not an insinuation, and this is equivalent to a positive assertion. He defended the authority of Papias, whom the opponent had treated as a fabulist, noticing in this sense that Eusebius blames him for some defects; but he does not lose his authority as a man capable of attesting a fact, if, for want of much sense, he falls into an error with regard to the millennial kingdom.

He equally defended the authority of Clement, wrongly described by the opponent as a man of little account, for having employed a metaphor treated as a fable, almost confounding it with history: and finally he showed that the opponent had passed over many other testimonies already adduced, although they were of great value according to Basnage himself. He historically demonstrated the arrival of St. Paul in Rome, and he went on to inquire if it could be negatived by the chronology of the Bible, as the opponent pretended, and he said, "No," because the result of the studies of the learned even to our own day was, that they gave diverse chronologies more or less founded, and one or other of which might prudently be followed in the research of smaller points of time, affecting the arrival of St. Peter in Rome, or the duration of his permanent abode. And this is not the whole of our case, as the presence of Peter in Rome must be excluded from every space of time, by opposing to it the dates which in the Bible are wanting for many facts, nevertheless, perhaps chronologically narrated. At all events, a certain chronology would be required, distinct, and admitted of all; and this is wanting by the confession of the opponent himself, who has said that one cannot be framed except on

the principle of the best possible. Following the steps of the opponent, he says that there can be no argument from the letters of St. Peter that the word "Babylon" indicates whence he wrote, because the writers, Catholic and Protestant, do not agree among themselves, whether, in the symbolic sense, Rome is intended, or, in the literal sense, Babylon in Chaldea. To the authority of Michaelis he opposed, besides the authority of the Fathers, that of Grotius and of other learned Protestants down to Ewald, of very recent date, and no reasons have been found beyond those already brought forward by the ancients which could help their cause. On the contrary, the most recent re-consideration was adverse. And here he noted that the reasons of Ewald, brought forward by Fabiani, which made our opponent laugh, were not produced by him as his own, but as those of the writer, without his giving any opinion whatever upon them.

Whatever may be said of this interpretation, he remarked that he and his colleagues on the present question did not put forward this Epistle, and that the Protestants could not turn it to their account; for, if taken in their sense, though that is not conceded, even then it would not conclude anything, because it might be a proof that Peter was in Babylon, but not a disproof of his ever having come to Rome. And here he noted the facility of travelling in those times already shown by his colleague.

Speaking of the argument taken from the Bible upon the nature of the apostleship of Peter to the circumcision, and of Paul to the Gentiles, he said that the nature of this mission was not exclusive, so as to hinder Peter from preaching to the Gentiles, or Paul to the Hebrews. He explained largely the sense of the agreement made between Paul, Cephas, James, &c., which was, namely, for a patronage or special care, which they should take of this portion or that, without laying aside the care that they ought to have for all, and did not hinder that Peter should come to Rome, especially in the sense of the thesis.

He then examined the argument of Sciarelli, which divided into three epochs the twenty-five years assigned by Catholics to Peter in Rome, and aimed at proving that Peter was not in Rome in the year 42, because in that year he was in Jerusalem. He might deny that the conversion of St. Paul took place in 39, which he (Sciarelli) fixed as the basis of his calculation, because it is a point on which even the Protestants are not themselves agreed. Let this, however, be supposed, but not conceded, he would still deny that it

proved that Peter could not have been in Rome. In the beginning of the year he might be in Jerusalem, in the later months in Rome: for if St. Luke describes what Peter did in these years in Jerusalem, that is, that he raised up a young woman, that he went into the house of Cornelius, as Sciarelli recounted, these were not such things that in order to accomplish them he must stay there all the year.

In regard to the second period, namely, from the years 42 to 56, he showed that the alleged impossibility of his coming was founded on the silence which Peter held with regard to it in the Council, while Paul spoke of his journeys; but that amounts to nothing. Perhaps he did not say anything, because his coming had already been recounted. Perhaps he mentioned it when he spoke of the fruits of his mission, noting that St. Luke indicates the subject of the discourse of Peter and Paul, and does not report their words. Neither because Paul spoke of his journey was it necessary that Peter should speak of his.

Touching the silence of St. Luke as to this period, and as to the subsequent one down to 66, he remarked that the silence does not contradict what St. Luke does not say, because it was not his design to speak of the voyage of Peter, but of Paul, whose actions he wished to relate. He showed that, if other things after the Council were wrought by Peter in Judæa, they could not be shown to be such as to prevent his coming to Rome. The measure, he said, which our opponents have of thus enlarging and prolonging is so convenient, that they might show that not twenty-five years alone were necessary, but even thirty. Finally, as to the silence of the Epistles of Paul, who does not send to the Churches the salutations of Peter, he said that that proves nothing, because it may be explained by the fact that these Epistles were written in circumstances when Peter was not in Rome, seeing that he did not stop there immovably. And, besides, other hypotheses might be set up to explain them. All this, nevertheless, constituted an argument merely negative; of no value against a positive argument drawn from historical documents; and he concluded that, if the opponents wished to be in the right, they must show that the Bible positively denied the fact. Then remarking that the second opponent had concluded his speech by saying that he put his trust in Christ, and that he did not desire the insinuations of men, he proclaimed that we all of us ought to put our trust in Him, using, however, the means established by Him,

that is, listening to the voice of his Apostolate. "*Fides ex auditu, auditus per verbum Christi* ;" therefore when it is insinuated by the legitimate man, we do not entrust ourselves to man, but entrust ourselves to Christ.

President.—It would now be the turn of Signor Gavazzi.

Gavazzi.—I rise to say that the hour is late, and as the audience is already very tired, if it is thought well the discussion can be adjourned till to-morrow evening, since, did I begin, I assure you that before half-past two o'clock in the morning the debate would not close. This is a liberty which I take, and I take it in all confidence, because we have permitted our honourable opponents to speak as much as they pleased. I am ready: all the more so as I have to reply upon a historical fact. The decision then rests with the Presidents, to say whether they wish the discussion to be resumed to-morrow evening at the point where we now leave off, or to go on this evening. (Voices: "No, no; to-morrow.")

President.—If you are afraid of the lateness of the hour, it may be adjourned till to-morrow. Those gentlemen who have received tickets for this evening can return to-morrow evening. If any of those gentlemen from any reason should not be able to return, or do not wish to come, they might be courteous enough to give back their tickets to the respective Presidents, that they might be given to so many others who have asked for them; or, even if any one meant not to return, he might give up his ticket at the door. There are many persons who have wished to have them, and have not been able to obtain them. If all wish to come again, then it is all right, to-morrow, at the same hour.

(*The audience began to move, and some words of the President were lost. It was a quarter past eleven.*)

SATURDAY EVENING, SEVEN O'CLOCK.

PRESIDENT Chigi.—The treatment of the Thesis will now be continued, that is, to show by arguments drawn from the Bible and the Holy Fathers, that St. Peter never was in Rome. I beg the audience to abstain from even the least sign of approval or disapprobation, not to disturb the order of the debate.

SIGNOR Piggott calls upon Signor Gavazzi to speak.

Gavazzi.—The question is now confined within its true limits, that is, to a historical fact, and as a historical fact we deny that St. Peter ever came to Rome; but as a historical fact our opponents affirm that St. Peter has been in Rome. There is a difference in our conclusions. The difference results from diversity in the proofs, as also from diversity in the mode of judging the fact. We confine ourselves to the Bible, and with it we deny absolutely that St. Peter came to Rome. Our opponents, entrenching themselves behind contemporary historical criticism, which we shall see translates itself into nothing but tradition, affirm that St. Peter did come to Rome. They reproach us with the insufficiency of our proofs, although they come from the Bible, since they say that silence is a negative proof, whereas an affirmative proof is required. They say, "Prove to us that the Bible has said St. Peter never did come to Rome." I may reply, "Prove to us that the Bible has said that St. Peter did come to Rome."

As the matter stands in these terms, I shall endeavour to show to the best of my power that the silence of the Bible is not a negative proof, but that it is a proof most positive and most explicit that St. Peter did not come to Rome.

On this question of silence permit a preliminary observation which is not out of place. Cardinal Bellarmine says that from the silence of the Bible it may be argued and ought to be inferred that St. Peter came to Rome; at the same time I find that Cardinal Baronius asserts that from the silence of the Bible it cannot be inferred that St. Peter ever was in Babylon. We have then a Cardinal who says that the silence of the Bible is a proof of the coming of St. Peter to Rome, and another Cardinal who affirms that from the silence of the Bible we cannot draw a proof that St.

Peter went to Babylon. Silence is then for you an elastic gum, which you pull as you please. But if from the silence of the Bible it ought to be deduced that St. Peter came to Rome, then by way of comparison I should say, Thiers in his History of the Consulate and the Empire does not speak at all of the journey of Napoleon the First to North America, or of a visit of his to Washington : then just because Thiers does not speak of it Napoleon did go to America and to Washington. Gentlemen, can we in logic admit such a conclusion? No; for he does not speak of it, just because Napoleon did not go. From the silence of the Bible, then, I draw my logical consequence that St. Peter did not come to Rome. I insist upon the proof of silence, and I shall show it to be positive. If the Bible had not had occasion to treat, and if it had not treated, the history of the primitive Church, in such a case contemporary history might have supplied to us the historical fact concerning which we are now arguing. But the Bible had to deal with the history of the primitive Church, wherefore we ought to take the principal facts of the history from the Bible itself. What, indeed, are the Acts of the Apostles? They are nothing else than the history,—true, official, authentic, particularized from the first—of the development, the progress, the persecutions suffered, and the triumphs won by the primitive Church. The principal end of this history is to narrate the labours of the glorious Apostles. The historian elected for this is Luke, who is the proper historian, the legitimate historian, the impartial historian, because the inspired historian. Could he have been silent as to the journey of St. Peter to Rome? No; he would have had no reason to be so as an inspired and impartial historian. He has spoken of Peter on all the occasions in which this Apostle was found labouring for his Lord; he has spoken of him in Samaria, he has spoken of him in Lydda, he has spoken of him in Joppa, he has spoken of him in Cæsarea, he has spoken of him in Jerusalem many times; why should he not speak of his coming to Rome?

Some one alleges that silence was opportune, that St. Peter might not be compromised. This excuse does not avail even for a pretext, because when St. Luke was writing his history the danger was past. Granting that danger there had once been, there then was nothing to compromise him. Then arises before my view justice,—he ought to have told it in order by anticipation to cut off anything that in after times might have lessened Peter. We cannot deny that in this primitive apostolic college the figure of

Peter appears as the principal, whether by a pre-eminence of word or by a pre-eminence of action, and in consequence Luke could not pass over this primary figure. Then comes the comprimary figure, which is that of Paul, an elect vessel,—of Paul because he had a special delegation, which was a true apostleship both in the apostolic commission and in the evangelistic. Peter coming to Rome, why should Luke neglect to write his journey? If he had never described any arrival in Rome, well and good; but he did describe the journey of the Apostle Paul in all its most minute particulars; and this Apostle Paul in the primitive apostolic college would only be a secondary figure, and his journey would only be of secondary importance. Wherefore, then, has Luke said nothing whatever of the primary personage in the primitive apostolic college and of his primary voyage? Why has he spoken of the one and passed over the other? Is it impartiality in an inspired writer? I should not think so. Consequently, and for the honour of the historical writer, I must say that if he does not narrate it, it is because he did not come. But it is said, It is a fact that St. Peter was in Rome because contemporaries speak of it; and I say that the inspired history, the natural, the original, the primary one, does not speak of it. It has never said this to us, and that would be an injustice, a partiality. If the primary historian does not speak of it, what becomes of the affirmation of the later ones? especially when of those later ones it may be said that there is not a single one that was an eye witness. They are not witnesses, they are only second-hand evidence, that is, bearing testimony *de auditu*; consequently, how should you expect the authority of the primary historian not to prevail when I have not even secondaries who affirm it, as we shall see? Hence it is that in this case the silence of the Bible is not a negative proof, but the positive proof, that St. Peter has not been in Rome, because the only history that ought to say it has not said it. Then he was not here.

And here I shall make a digression, to say two words as to an objection which was brought forward last night, namely, that it was not so difficult for Peter to come to Rome, but that he might have had time in the intervals of events that were spoken of yesterday evening in chronology, on account of the facility of the journey, since my excellent opponent, who is most learned and erudite, held that the journey from Jerusalem to Rome was so easy, that in eighteen days you could accomplish it.

Gentlemen, I say nothing of the facility of coming from Jerusalem

to Rome in those times, because I believe that you know the difficulty that exists to-day in going to Jerusalem, with all the railways, and all the steamers; but I would have our opponents reflect that it is not true what was said yesterday evening, that it was more easy to come from Jerusalem to Rome than to go from Jerusalem to Babylon, because it is proved geographically that to go from Jerusalem to Babylon, you needed a quarter of the time that was needed to come to Rome by the most practicable roads, for they were not the roads of the present day. But here the question is not of the time nor of the facility for St. Peter to come to Rome. He might have had plenty of time and all facility, for our position is, that he did not come; because I say that if he had come either under Claudius or under Nero, or before or after the Council of Jerusalem, Luke would have said it, because he ought to have said it in justice to the Apostleship of Peter, in justice to the primitive Church, in justice to the Church of Rome, in justice to himself. Luke has not said it: then his silence is a positive proof that he did not come, because, I repeat it, if he had come he ought to have said it.

And here passing from the principal history which I should call the absolutely necessary in this our fact, to such as I should call the incidentally necessary, which are all the other parts of the New Testament in which might occur the mention of the coming of St. Peter to Rome, I add the proposition that the silence even of this part of the history proves the non-arrival of St. Peter in Rome, and, above all, the argument turns upon the silence which St. Paul held on divers occasions as to the coming of St. Peter to Rome, when he ought to have mentioned it. I heard it said yesterday evening that in this silence of St. Paul there was a reason of discretion. I do not understand what kind of discretion there could have been either on the part of Peter or on the part of Paul. Not to compromise Peter? Gentlemen, no. I have too much respect for Peter to believe that he was such a poltroon, such a coward, and so timorous, as to be frightened at martyrdom; and I have too much respect for Paul to believe that he would have such an opinion of his co-Apostle. It is said, "But it might have brought him too much into view, naming him among the Christians." O, Gentlemen, by this Paul would compromise no one, because Paul was too noble and too delicate (and moreover an inspired writer) to compromise

any one whatever: consequently, if he did not think that it compromised those his helpers who were with him in prison, and did not think that he compromised even those who were of the household of Cæsar when he sent to salute them, much less do I think that he would be in fear of compromising Peter by a salutation which he might have sent to him. I insist that the silence of Paul on so many occasions proves nothing else, but proves at least this, that at the time in which Paul wrote to Rome, and wrote from Rome, at least at that time Peter was not in Rome.

Here we have a sufficient quantity of proofs whence to infer that he could not have come unless it might have been as some will have it, in the very last days of his life.

But in the Bible, Gentlemen, there are not only what you call the negative proof of silence, but also those which I should call positive proofs, which are neither negation nor silence. Yesterday evening the prophecy of Christ was mentioned, and it was said that as John wrote these things after Peter had been crucified, that crucifixion must have taken place. Very good. But let us place this prophecy in John, side by side with another of Christ's in St. Matthew, in the twenty-third chapter, where He reproves the Pharisees, saying, "Ye will crucify some one of My Apostles." Then according to the words of Christ it was to be the Jews who were to crucify some one of His Apostles. Now we have only two Apostles who were crucified, one in tradition, namely, Andrew, another in the Bible, Peter. Therefore, the prophecy must have particularly indicated Peter. But Christ charges this crucifixion upon the Jews. It must then have occurred by the action of the Jews, and consequently could not have happened in Rome, where the Jews had no power whatever, but must have happened in some place where they had power. This place could not be any other than Babylon, because Babylon was a place where the Jews, as we shall see, were in greater number and greater power, even in such power that the King of the Parthians had granted to them to have a High Priest, and that they had all the forms of their Mosaic law still existing. In this part of the dispersion, then, they were very powerful; and so we may argue reasonably and logically, taking our stand upon history, that the crucifixion of St. Peter must be attributed to the Jews. But in Babylon, during the persecution of Nero, they had an opportunity to excite the anger of the governors against Peter, and to procure his crucifixion, in the same way as, under Tiberius, availing themselves of

the privileges of autonomy which the Roman law had left to them, they obtained the crucifixion of Jesus Christ.

The manner wherein St. Peter was put to death is not conformed to the Roman usage, but to that of the barbarians, practised by the Parthians. Crucifixion with the head down was not practised by the Romans. The Romans crucified with the head up, in order that the suffering might endure longer; in fact, so long did it endure, that to put the patient to death the legs were broken. The penalty of crucifixion with the head down appeared more ignominious, but it lasted a less time from asphyxia, and to render it still shorter, the barbarians were in the habit of kindling straw under the head, by which the patient was suffocated. The manner, then, of the crucifixion of Peter is an historical proof that he was not crucified in Rome, but that he must have been crucified in Babylon.

Yesterday it was said with some emphasis, that this could not be, because, the Babylonian provinces not being subject to the Roman yoke, the persecution of Nero could not have there taken effect. I could not help feeling considerable astonishment at this observation, since I have too much respect for my opponents, and especially for the distinguished scholar who yesterday evening delivered the first reply, to think that they can be ignorant of what Eusebius tells us on this subject. Eusebius clearly says that the Babylonian provinces were subject to Nero, explicitly says that Nero commenced his persecution after having subjugated the Babylonian provinces. These provinces, then, were already under the Romans, and the persecution began after the Roman occupation. That the persecutions of Nero did extend to the Babylonian provinces is known on the authority of Orosius, which will be acknowledged to be the highest, because he produces a number of witnesses sufficiently worthy of attention in reference to the extension of the persecutions of Nero in the provinces of Babylonia. On this supposition every thing appears natural, and we understand how Peter being at Babylon, in the centre of his apostolate, should write of his approaching death, and should anticipate the announcement of his martyrdom to his flocks, and that he should animate them by the example of the courageous acts of witness-bearing accomplished by others, and especially in the city of Rome. The manner then in which St. Peter was crucified, leads me to the conclusion that he was not

at Rome even for his martyrdom, but that he was subjected to martyrdom in the Chaldaic Babylon:

Another proof for us, Biblical and positive, that St. Peter did not come to Rome, I find in the apostolate of St. Paul in Rome itself, not so much from what he says in the first chapter of his Epistle to the glorious fathers in Rome, quoted yesterday, as from what is said in the fifteenth chapter of the same Epistle. In the first chapter Paul, as you will remember, says to the Romans, that he desires exceedingly to see them, to communicate to them some spiritual gift, that they may be strengthened. Now would it be according to good logic, and would it not be still less according to justice, that he should so speak, if Peter had already communicated this gift, and had already confirmed the Romans? But in the fifteenth chapter and the twentieth verse he says, "And I have so preached this Gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation." If Paul did not wish to preach where Christ had been mentioned, that he might not build upon another man's foundation, by coming to Rome where Peter already was, (I speak of the epoch in which he wrote to the Romans,) he would have built upon the foundation of Peter, and he would have evangelized where Peter had already evangelized, which would be contrary to what he wrote to the Romans. Had he been writing to others, well and good; but by so writing to the Romans, he proves that no one had evangelized before him, because he was not willing to build upon another man's foundation.

I do not mean to say that before the arrival of Paul the Gospel had not been preached, or, to speak more correctly, had not been carried into Rome. I do not shut out Peter from having a part, by the medium of his converts, in the foundation of the Church of Rome, since at the Pentecost the Romans who were present, having left Jerusalem, carried the Gospel to Rome.

I do not say that there was not a Church in Rome, that there was not Christianity; but that the Gospel had not been preached by Peter, but carried by disciples of Peter and Paul, and especially by Aquila and Priscilla, before that Paul came to Rome. But it was not as yet the Gospel preached in the face of the Gentiles and the Cæsars; it was still a preaching in private, in families. It was not as yet a preaching by an apostolic person.

Neither let it be objected that it may still be said that Peter had preached the Gospel, if not to others, to the Israelites, because we know from the Acts of the Apostles that when Paul came to Rome

he gathered the Jews around him, and these showed him that they knew nothing as yet concerning this sect, of which no one could have given them information. And this proof, the apostolate of St. Paul, leads me to the conclusion that up to that moment the Gospel had not been among the Hebrews in Rome, and for me these are positive proofs that St. Peter had not been in Rome.

But it was said yesterday, that the Apostles had from Christ the mandate in their apostolical and evangelic commissions to go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature; and hence there was no prohibition against going to Rome, and among the rest there was no prohibition for Peter. Here, Gentlemen, I wish you to pay a little attention.

We maintain the thesis that Peter *did* not come, not that Peter *could* not come. In consequence, when I speak of history and not of Biblical exegesis, (because I could prove in another sense that he could not come, considering his special mission to the Hebrews,) then I say not, indeed, that he could not come, because he could have come, but that he did not come.

In fact, all the Apostles had the power to go and preach the Gospel to every creature. Well, did all the Apostles come to Rome, because they were not prohibited? No, they did not come. How do you know that they did not come? Because St. Luke does not say it; and then I say, No more did Peter come, for the same reason, that Luke does not say it, and if he had come, Luke must have said it. And I insist upon the word "must," although some will say to me, "Where did they go?" They went where Divine grace inspired them to go, where the Spirit, as we have it in the Acts of the Apostles, showed them to go; and this Spirit is the guide that we find throughout the whole Bible, who regulates all the steps of the Apostles; so that I find the beautiful text as to Paul and Barnabas: "When they had passed through Phrygia and the country of Galatia, they were forbidden by the Holy Ghost to preach the Word in Asia. And when they came into Mysia they attempted to go into Bithynia, and the Spirit of Jesus suffered them not." (Acts xv. 6, 7.) And wherefore all this hindrance and prohibition? Because these countries were the special field of Peter, because Christ did not wish encroachments in the apostolate, and Paul did not wish to build upon another man's foundation.

So that, Gentlemen, here I am obliged to say a thing which all know: *Deus et natura nihil agunt frustra*. No, God works nothing needlessly; and God having expressly chosen an Apostle for

the Gentiles, to carry Hisname before the Kings, and having called Paul to this mission, no one was to encroach on the apostolate of Paul, and the Spirit would not have permitted it ; so that, Gentlemen, there is a word in the Bible, (and it is the Word of God Himself, which for me avails more than all the authorities that may be opposed to me,) against the coming of St. Peter to Rome. I have the Word of God to Paul, Acts xxiii. 11 : "As thou hast testified of Me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome."

Of no other Apostle, not of Peter himself, were these words said, that he must bear witness in Rome ; and it is on this account that I say that Paul did come, because there is the voice of God which calls him hither, the Spirit of God which impels him hither, and the Scriptures of God which have narrated it for me. Then how can they attempt to deny that there are positive words in the Scriptures? Why will they attempt to cast doubt upon such clear evidence?

Yesterday they wished to make a vagabond of Paul, and why deny a similar facility to Peter? Pardon the word "vagabond," because I do not think that an Apostle who goes about to evangelize ought to be called a vagabond or a vagrant. However, if the journey of Paul is beyond doubt, it is because I find it recorded ; and if I do not admit the journey of Peter, it is because I do not find it recorded. Peter goes to Lydda, to Joppa, to Cæsarea, to Samaria, to Antioch, and comes back to stay in Jerusalem : it is mentioned. Paul goes to many places of the east and of the west : it is mentioned. As you could not ask me to deny that Paul has been in Corinth, in Athens, in Thessalonica, in Macedonia, in Rome, because I read it in the Bible, so you cannot ask me to believe that Peter has been in Rome, because this I do not read. This never was said, never written, by the inspired authors. It is on this account I say that in the Bible are found not only what you call the negative proof of silence, but I say and maintain that I find even positive proof, that Peter has not been in Rome, since his crucifixion itself, by its necessity and nature, carries me at the very last period of his life to Babylon, where particularly he held his apostolate in the midst of the Dispersion. Peter had not come to Rome, not because he could not have come, but because, as I say, the Spirit of God prohibited him, and because Peter was designated to carry the Gospel to the circumcision and Paul to the Gentiles.

As to the Biblical proof of the non-arrival of St. Peter in Rome it is necessary that I reply to some observations of my learned opponents of yesterday evening as to chronology, and, in particular, as to the date from Babylon.

I commence with the chronology. It was said by my learned opponent in the first speech, that, as to chronology, everything is still in obscurity and uncertainty. I admit that there are yet imperfections; I admit that perhaps still we must proceed in the midst of obscurity and uncertainty; I admit that this is a matter which God has given over to the disputations of men, since whether it be by the nature of the matter related, or by the habit of the narrator, either in the New Testament generally, or in the Gospels especially, we find that they do not pay attention to dates, and consequently it behoves lovers of truth, of whatever shade they may be, who devote themselves with sincerity and affection to this study, to find the most approximate dates of Biblical chronology; and here we speak of the New Testament, for then we shall arrive at a Biblical conclusion.

Yesterday evening the observation was made that the art of verifying the chronological dates of the Bible is so obscure, that we cannot settle the epoch of the arrival of St. Paul in Rome. I beg pardon. The epoch of the arrival of St. Paul in Rome is in the year 61; and comes from an ascertained date. When men have in hand an ascertained date, it is like Archimedes, who, had he obtained a fulcrum, could have moved the world with his lever. The ascertained date is the arrival of Portius Festus the Governor, and we know that this occurred in 61, and in the same year Paul was sent a prisoner to Rome. I find that is an ascertained date. Some might say it is not yet quite certain, there is still some little doubt, (for me, no,) since it is not altogether positive that Portius arrived in that year. I should make then a slight observation, and it is that the ascertained date is this, namely, that Paul arrived in Rome the year that the Governor Portius arrived, a year fixed by profane history, since the date of the arrival of this Governor is known from the consular and imperial acts.

And even if you showed me that this is not yet well settled, then I should take the argument of the learned Fabiani of yesterday evening, who said that, by the new discoveries, he had found chronological dates which have so intoxicated the minds of some who were not favourable to the Bible, as to make them exclaim that by these discoveries the Biblical dates were all destroyed.

I have already said to my honourable opponent that I do not fear that, and even he will not fear it, because the Bible is four square against every assault, and will always triumph.

But I say, that if you have been able to find by new discoveries these perfectly certain dates, and to fix your chronology, you will be able to arrive by other discoveries at some monument, at some stone, which can tell us more certainly that Portius arrived as Governor in Judea in such a year. Here then we have in the Bible ascertained dates, and it is not true that all is in obscurity: there is one ascertained date, and we know that when we can depart from the known for the unknown it is not so difficult to reach our point.

Nor do all the ascertained dates end here, because we have another positive datum in the Bible to enable us to fix a date, and that is the going up of St. Paul to Jerusalem three years after his conversion, or fourteen years afterwards for the meeting of the Council.

I was almost frightened yesterday when I heard that it might be objected to us by Atheists and Rationalists that we had only one testimony, and that we could quote no one but the Apostle Paul. Gentlemen, when I have in my hands an inspired writer, when this writer speaks of a positive fact, of a personal fact, I do not fear though it were ten million of Atheists and Rationalists; they are impotent to strike down a Colossus such as one inspired writer.

Then Paul suffices for me; and when I have the testimony of Paul giving me two ascertained dates, I go forward and say, as we have the known, we should arrive at what is unknown. If this mode of proceeding be not admitted, there can be no study of chronology.

The question then depends on when the conversion of St. Paul occurred. I do not spend more words upon this point; I say to my learned adversaries that I do not allow myself to be awed by any one, not even by Ellendorf, of whom I specially reject one portion of his chronology, that the death of Stephen and the persecutions against the Christians immediately succeeded one another. This difference may be perhaps small, and cannot alter the grand traits and lineaments of Biblical history. The stoning of Stephen may be clearly proved to have taken place under Tiberius, but the persecutions against the Christians did not happen at the same period. This I say, because the character of Tiberius was adverse to persecutions; on the contrary, he prevented persecutions to which he was solicited by the Roman Senators, who wished the Christians expelled from Rome. Under Tiberius, Stephen may have been put to death, as Jesus Christ had been put to death by the instigation

of the Jews, who accused the one and the other of blasphemy, and by that phantom of autonomy which the Romans had left to them, they procured in the case of Jesus the consent of Pilate to their desire. Under Tiberius, then, the death of Stephen might happen; but I repeat again that the persecutions could not happen; they occurred under Caligula. But under Caligula the persecutions raged. We cannot admit that under Caligula occurred the death of Stephen. From this Biblical text I deduce an argument whereby I prove that at the time of the death of Stephen Paul was yet a youth. He kept the raiment of those who stoned Stephen; he had not yet come to the age when they put on the *toga virilis*, he was a minor. Therefore we must leave a space between the death of Stephen, which happened at a time in which Paul was yet a minor, and the persecutions that occurred when Paul must have been of full age, as he obtained from the High Priests letters to head the persecutions, which would not have been granted to a youth. You see, then, that with chronology and with some calculation it is possible, taking our departure from a known, to discover an unknown; nay, I repeat that the chronology, as was in a certain manner proved yesterday, even leads us to conclude that the Apostle Peter has not been in Rome.

I say, however, for the second time, I raise no question about time or opportunity, because St. Peter would have had full time and opportunity in the interval; I say only that he did not come. Then in chronology we have a proof in very many data that St. Peter never came to Rome. Passing from chronology to the *special mission*, I not only accept, but I absolutely maintain, the opinion of my learned first opponent, that we must not restrict this commission; on the contrary, it is fitting that we should always proceed with this good rule of wisdom dictated by Christ, who said that the Gospel must be preached first in Jerusalem, then in Judea, then in Samaria, and finally to the ends of the earth, which is as much as to say, we should first act at home, then among the dispersed sheep of the house of Israel, and then among Gentiles.

I admit, then, that thus Peter was an Apostle of the Gentiles, as well as of the Hebrews, as Paul was an Apostle of the Hebrews as well as of the Gentiles. As to this we raise no question; but I insist that a special commission was given to these two Apostles. I here speak particularly of the commission of St. Peter, because that leads towards my conclusion. It was observed yesterday evening that in what is said in the Epistle to the Galatians, we

may see a friendly agreement between the Apostles, or, as would be said in our day, a compromise. No, Gentlemen, it is not an agreement nor a compromise; it is a special commission from God Himself. And, observe, that if even it had been but an agreement among themselves, being an agreement of persons guided by the Spirit of God, we must always suppose that they would have treated such an agreement made among them with veneration. But I do not insist upon an agreement, but upon a special commission, since I find in the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians: (ii. 7-9 :) "When they had seen that to me was committed the Gospel of the uncircumcision, as to Peter was that of the circumcision, for He who wrought in Peter to the Apostleship of the circumcision, wrought in me also among the Gentiles, and when they had known the grace that was given to me, James, and Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision." It is not then an agreement, but it is that they recognised in him the grace of the Lord, who had committed to him the Gospel for the uncircumcised and the Gentiles. Thus it was a real commission, the appointment of which came from God Himself. And now by this commission, Gentlemen, (as yesterday evening for several reasons of convenience my good and most excellent opponent observed was most agreeable to the Jews,) I find that by this special commission Peter should primarily and, in a certain mode, almost exclusively labour for the Jews. He who had obtained, as Ambrose says, a primacy, a primacy of faith, a primacy of speech, among the Jews on the day of Pentecost, a primacy which God had promised him, and which he so maintained that Peter was the first to publish the Gospel in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost: God granted to him, if you will, the primacy also of action as well as the primacy of word, in the first announcement of the Gospel to the Gentiles in Cæsarea, in the baptism of the first from among them, which for us is a great national glory, since it was an Italian, a Roman of the Cornelia family, and we can say that for us it is glorious that the first Gentile converted to Christianity, and baptized, was not only an Italian, but also a Roman.

Peter took a principal part in the Council of Jerusalem, on the question of the circumcision, and had to go to Antioch, where Hebrews lived, particularly to deal with this question.

It was objected yesterday, "But if Peter laboured so much for the Hebrews, he must necessarily have come to Rome, because even at Rome there were Hebrews:" but I reply, What could poor Peter have done if he had been obliged to go wherever there were Hebrews? He must have gone round the whole world, because the Hebrews were scattered even then over the entire world; and I find that Paul met with them wherever he went. Then even this is not a good argument, because in such a case Peter would have been obliged, according to you, to perform over again all the journeys made by Paul, to speak to the Hebrews scattered everywhere.

But it is said that he must have come particularly to Rome, because that in Rome the Hebrews were powerful. I reply that in Rome they were not powerful as in Alexandria, where they were morally and materially potent and influential, as also scientifically, having there their famous academy, where indeed the version of the Seventy was made. Perhaps on this account, he went to Alexandria? No. Then I find no reason why he should have come to Rome, only because the Jews were powerful in it.

I ask pardon of my good and learned adversary if, in his enthusiasm for Cicero, for whom I also am enthusiastic, he said that he was obliged to speak low, because the Jews were powerful. In money I do not deny it, but by multitude, or by social position, they were not powerful, because we know that, in spite of the fact that in the time of Claudius and Nero Rome was not what it was under Trajan,—we know positively that the authors of that time did not set the number of Jews above five or six thousand, and five or six thousand Hebrews among five million of Romans made only a very small fraction.

Then it cannot be said that he came here to evangelize the Hebrews, and Peter must have gone where the Hebrews were not only considerable for their money or social position, but where they were in great number and of powerful influence, as they were in the Chaldean provinces, whither his Apostleship called him, among the dispersed sheep of the house of Israel. The Jews were numerous in the provinces of Babylon, partly by recent immigration, partly because many Hebrews had never returned after the Babylonian captivity. We have Flavius and Strabo, who affirm that there were myriads and myriads, and who make for us a calculation of not less than four millions in the heart of Asia and in the provinces of Babylon alone. Then, dear Gentlemen, let Peter go into the very

centre of his Apostleship, into the midst of Babylon. But they will say to me, "Where will you make him go specially after that James and John divided among themselves the Apostleship of the circumcision which they had held with Peter?" Leave John free to go to Ephesus, leave James in Jerusalem, and follow Peter into the centre of his mission, among the Hebrews, to the capital of the dispersion of the twelve tribes, not as a proper capital, but because it included the greater number of Israelitish strangers, or those of the dispersion. When I find that it is Peter himself who testifies to the fidelity of his mission, as this is the honour of his Apostleship, why would ye wish to take it from him? Peter received the mission to the wandering sheep of the house of Israel: we find that the centre of this mission is Babylon, as he testifies to me, and I find that you wish to destroy this testimony, saying that the date of his letter is a metaphor, and that consequently under this metaphor we must understand Rome, and that Babylon must be taken as a metaphor, and not otherwise. Then why must we take it for a metaphor? To hide himself. I do not say that my good and learned opponents wished to advance this opinion, but some have objected that it was done to conceal himself from his persecutors. I repeat that it was not fear of the persecutors, all the more because martyrdom had been prophesied for him by Christ Himself. Then it is not a metaphor to conceal himself. Is it a metaphor, then, from poetical style or literary caprice? O, in an Apostle that would be ridiculous. Yesterday evening it was said that a letter would be ridiculous with a poetical date instead of a literal one, and to-day I would call it ridiculous in the Apostle St. Peter to have employed this metaphor, because, remember, it was perhaps later than the Apocalypse (which was so many years after) that the death of Peter took place. Now the metaphor is used in the time of Peter, and to the men who lived at the same time with Peter. If the metaphor was used after the Apocalypse by a levity of style, we might let it pass, but even then we should be obliged to observe that John had written against Babylon, personifying it in the woman who made the Kings and the people to commit fornication; consequently he gave it a distinguishing mark, and called it Babylon "the Great." But Peter did not say, Babylon the Great: he said Babylon; and as Babylon had not been named in his times by any one, not even by John in the Apocalypse, then how can we understand Rome by Babylon? By Babylon I must understand what it is, namely, the capital of Chaldea, which was the centre of

his true Apostleship, and his mission to the sheep of Israel. And remember, there is yet another observation to be made, which is inherent to the Bible, and it is when this word occurs, when he says, "The Church which is with me in Babylon elect with me salutes you." Now when I find constantly in all the Epistles that it is said to me, "The Church that is in Corinth," "The Church that is in Ephesus," "The Church that is in Philippi," "salutes you," why will you have it that the Apostle when he comes forth to say, "The Church that is with me in Babylon," meant Rome to be understood? It would have been an insult to Rome in his time to call it Babylon, in the sense in which St. John called it so. And, remember, that the commentators and students are not certain even that by this word "Babylon" pagan Rome was intended, because some would have it that Rome was meant, and some Constantinople. Then it cannot be said all at once that by Babylon even John intended Rome, since if it is in doubt to-day among the great commentators whether or not by Babylon in the Apocalypse Rome was intended, we can still less understand Babylon to mean Rome in the letter of St. Peter, which would be ridiculous and insulting.

Yesterday evening I was told that the very position of the words in this letter proves that it must have started from Rome instead of Babylon. Were it not for the sincere veneration which I have for my first objector, I should say that he himself did not believe in this geographical description, because, while the description of the provinces is legitimate starting from Babylon, it becomes altogether illegitimate starting from Rome.

Having perceived his error, he sought a pretext, and said that the letter was dated from Rome, and consigned to navigators that went to Pontus. But my learned adversary had before said that to come to Rome Peter would have started from Cæsarea, and that he would have only taken about fifteen days on the voyage. But then, why not make the letter go by the same road? Why make it pass through the whole Mediterranean and part of the Adriatic, enter the Hellespont, and go through the Black Sea to reach Pontus? Instead of this very long route, why not have chosen the shortest?

My opponent said that the letter passed over the longest route because Peter had consigned it to the sellers of tunny fish. I do not think that the Apostles consigned their letters to the sellers of tunny fish, because I read that they did consign them always to

the most faithful of the disciples. Hence, I cannot admit the geography which was expounded to us yesterday evening, and I believe that, considering the position of the countries indicated in the letter of St. Peter, that letter itself could not have started from Rome, but did start really from Babylon.

One of our adversaries displayed a certain emphatic wonder because one of my excellent colleagues had quoted Michaelis, who will not allow the meaning Rome for the expression "Babylon." He said that if Michaelis excludes this interpretation, Grotius thinks it natural and reasonable. Let Grotius think it rational or not, it is nothing to me, because Eusebius does not think it rational. Having cited the passage of Papias, Eusebius says, "A report circulated that this Mark, be it the Evangelist or be it the one whom he mentions in his First Epistle, which professes to be written from Babylon, and under that metaphor from Rome, and this," adds Eusebius, "this metaphor is too hardy." Thus, he speaks not of a fact, but of a report that was in circulation, and we know what reports in circulation are.

Then let Grotius admit the metaphor, though Eusebius finds it too hardy. I should stand with Eusebius, and let my opponent stand with Grotius. But there is something more: Jerome in his commentary on Isaiah says that in his time the Hebrews tried to substitute Rome for Babylon; not wishing to confess the Babylonian captivity, they referred to the Roman, and he says that one must be a fool to permit them to substitute Rome for Babylon.

Then, Gentlemen, even for Jerome such a substitution would have been a folly, and how can we admit it, much less wish it, especially in the Epistle of St. Peter, which among other things was inspired? And then the date of Babylon being for me the true Babylon carries me where the Apostle Peter, faithful to his Apostolic commission, planted the banner of his Apostleship, and where he died; and here is the conclusion at which I arrive,—WHERE HE DIED. But it is said, if he died in Babylon, why did that city not make an outcry to reclaim the honour of the martyrdom of St. Peter? I reply without any emphasis that this is a very simple matter; first of all because in the times of the blessed Apostles in that primitive simplicity they did not make so much ado and so much noise about the death, nay, not even of the Apostles. It is true that in the profane history of Greece there were seven cities that contended for Homer, but when I come into Christianity I find in the Acts of the Apostles that after Stephen was stoned his

friends mourned for him, and buried him ; that is all. Thus were buried all the blessed Apostles who were martyred, and there was no great stir made to receive their bones, and to honour them after death. Here is a very simple reason drawn from the times.

In the second place it is said, " But if he died in Babylon, and Rome had claimed his death for herself, Babylon would have been excited." First of all, as at that time no one in Rome did claim the death of Peter, Babylon was not excited. It began only in the fourth century to be determined that Peter had been in Rome, for it was never so determined previously, until the time when Babylon was already what would now be called a diocese *in partibus infidelium* ; and, hence, who was there to make reclamations? No one. Thus, you see, that this objection is of no force.

But it is said, Why do you make him die in Babylon ? Because I find that the final Epistles of the Apostles indicate to us the place of their death. We know positively that Paul died in Rome, even from the last Epistle that he wrote to Timothy, in which he gave the announcement of his approaching decapitation ; hence, he died in Rome. But Peter wrote his second letter in the same city where he had written the first, and this is undoubted, because it is directed to the same dispersion, and because it speaks of his approach to martyrdom, and prepares his flocks for it. This was written from Babylon, and in Babylon did he die. Thus everything comes naturally, and taking even the last of the objections drawn from the word "Babylon," this, however, considered in its simplicity, does not at all prove that Peter ever was in Rome, since he remained faithful to his commission, which was to the erring sheep of the house of Israel. It is said, however, that his relics are in Rome ; and remember that many put forward this argument : " If his relics are in Rome, then he was martyred in Rome." Here, it is said, is his tomb, or his monument, or his trophy, or his martyr-memorial, and therefore St. Peter was martyred in Rome. By no means : that proves nothing. There was a martyr-memorial of Lorenzo at Ravenna, and Lorenzo was not martyred at Ravenna ; there was a martyr-memorial of Stephen in Ancona, and Stephen was not martyred in Ancona ; there were twelve martyr-memorials in honour of the Twelve Apostles in Constantinople in the time of St. Sophia, and the Twelve Apostles were not martyred in Constantinople. Then even should there be tombs, martyr-memorials, and trophies of the Apostle Peter in Rome, that would not prove that he died in Rome. But his relics ? Softly with these relics, Gentlemen !

I do not speak of my own time, I speak of the times to which we refer, which are the earliest ages of the Church. In Rome, I am told, there is the body of St. Stephen in one of your basilicas; remember, I am told it: I do not guarantee it; but because the relics of St. Stephen are found in Rome, perhaps St. Stephen suffered his martyrdom in Rome? Perhaps he never was present in Rome? Then, Gentlemen, do not bring forward superficially the argument of the relics of St. Peter in Rome. Granted that they were in Rome, yet it would not be a valid argument, for they might have been carried thither from somewhere else.

As to these relics, however, I find in Eusebius, since you are so fond of this coeval ancient history, that Eusebius himself tells me that it is not improbable that the relics of Peter were found in Rome in the times of Nero. He says, it is not improbable. Then it is not certain. And so Augustine speaks of it: *Dicunt homines*: "People say that the body of Peter is in Rome." Further he says, "The body of Paul is there." You see that as to Paul he affirms, and as to Peter he suggests,—*People say so*. Then Peter's body being here is a report, not a certainty; Paul's is beyond doubt. And, finally, I shall conclude by quoting what I find in Julian the Apostate, (I should be sorry to find it only in Julian the Apostate, but as I find it also in Cyril of Alexandria, who confirms it, and takes it for a fact, which in his time he had received as certain information,) that while John was writing his Gospel the trophies, the martyr-memorials, the sepulchral urns, of the Apostles Peter and Paul were carried in procession around from place to place by devout bearers. The conclusion is, that you can found very little upon these relics, and take it that everything stood in its own place, that every one kept the body of his own Apostle. But yet tradition is rumour, rumour, and nothing but rumour. We know of no city that ever made a strife for the relics of the Apostles; they were left where they died; but we are not certain as to any one.

With the Bible in hand, Gentlemen, we have not only the proof which is called "negative," and silence which to me sufficiently demonstrates that Peter never was in Rome, but we have positive proofs and the other concomitant ones, of the crucifixion of the Apostle Peter, of his special commission, of the Apostleship of Paul, and of the date of Babylon, all which lead me to conclude that St. Peter never did come to Rome. And if you refuse the certain testimony of the Bible you must supplement it by an authentic historical fact, by a contemporaneous affirmation, and that is what you will

never be able to do. Now, not having other proofs to show that St. Peter has been in Rome, you have fallen upon the Bible, which is your rule of faith, and which can never contradict itself, and I shall always reply to you, "Prove by the Bible that St. Peter has been in Rome, if you wish to stand by the Bible." But Biblical proof not being forthcoming, my opponents take refuge in contemporary history, and tell me that the silence of the Bible is compensated for by historical affirmation. If, the negation of the Bible being acknowledged in a historical question, we could have a positive intimation of contemporary history, then we might dispute whether or not we should receive the substitute; but since I affirm that contemporary history does not prove, either explicitly or approximately, the coming of St. Peter to Rome, the Biblical negative remains. Gentlemen, here we must not go forward with uncertainties and obscurities, with, as Eusebius says, rumours that circulate, vague reports, with "they say," "it is supposed;" but we must proceed on positive facts. Now when I speak of contemporary history, I mean true historians of the first grade. Consequently, only contemporary historians are witnesses *de visu*, that is, by eyesight, in so far as they have personal knowledge of the men and things whereof they speak.

After these in the second grade come witnesses *de auditu*, who receive from the witnesses *de visu* a narrative of the facts, and hand them down, but in a second rank.

Then after these the third, that is, those who receive narrations from the first which they have heard from them, and thus the third are only collectors, and are but improperly called historians.

After the third I take no notice of the others. Let them come by millions, I shall not any longer call them historians; I shall call them collectors, gatherers of information. I may call them historians for the critical judgment and philosophy which they may bring to the composition of these things, but true historians are only coevals or contemporaries. And then if in one of these posterior historians I find the things already said by the first witnesses, I call him a copyist; if I find new things, I call him a fabulist. But it is said, "We have a great mass of these witnesses: then the multitude itself proves that the fact was true and notorious." Softly, I shall proceed with a comparison. Titus Livius, the Roman historian, when narrating things which he had collected from the consular *fasti*, from the inscriptions, from the monuments, and from all that we call "aids to history," for the greater part is veracious

and may be believed; but when he enters upon the "it is said" of the vulgar, then he weaves fables of the *origines* of Rome which lose themselves in Pagan mythology. But because these things were said by Titus Livius, for seventeen centuries all admitted his gossip upon the origin of Rome; but to-day, with criticism and with philosophy, who any longer admits it? No one. Then to what does the mass of witnesses which has been heaped up serve? And so, Gentlemen, in following centuries St. Peter in Rome was invented, and it was not found in contemporary writers. If even a million of those witnesses who were not either *de visu* or *de auditu*, though most respectable men, should come forward and affirm it, I should say that they were only fabulists.

In fact, yesterday evening it could not be denied that in truth there were no contemporary writers but one, Clement, and all the rest were secondary *de auditu*; add that the contemporary writer has not one positive affirmation, not an explicit statement, but a graceful allusion. And why? "Because," reply my opponents, "the fact was so notorious that that sufficed." Gently; because I may reply on my side that the fact was so notorious that Peter had died in the East, and Paul in the West, that it was sufficient to allude to their death, because then, with the notorious facts, one would believe that Paul had died in Rome, and the other would believe that Peter had died in Babylon. Then let us go quietly with this notorious fact, because it may be taken in the mode and way in which every one understands it. But, Gentlemen, permit me to say, when you have spoken of the graceful allusion, you have not attributed much authority or reason to the historians whom you have cited in your support. History does not arise from allusions, but from truth. From allusions arise fables, mythology, and, if you will, tradition. Truth is naked: allusions are a veil which covers flaws. For history you do not need allusions; and if it is so, of what use are your documents?

Yesterday you conceded much in saying that the passage from St. Clement had been tampered with, and that for the words "a most noble example of our times," the expression had been substituted, "a most noble example of our city." Then, having substituted "city" for "times," you apply to Rome all that is said of Christianity in general. But what did Clement say on that point? Clement, the single writer contemporary to the facts of which we are speaking, when does he mention Peter? He says that Peter, after having endured many persecutions, suffered martyrdom. But

where did he suffer persecutions? In the West? No; we find that he suffered persecutions in Jerusalem, and in other parts of the East. But when he comes to speak of Paul, what does he say? He says, that after having traversed all the West, even to its extreme boundaries, he gave up his life in the face of the Governors of the world. Remark in what manner he specifies Rome! Now, in the only coeval writer who speaks of these facts you do not find one word touching the presence of Peter in Rome, while he authenticates the presence of Paul in this city.

Not to take up time, I shall not speak of the testimony of Ignatius, because Baronius and Bellarmine tell me that it is not testimony to be produced. As to Papias, regarding whom there was so much discussion yesterday, I congratulate myself that even my excellent opponents have acknowledged the authenticity of the text of Eusebius, not interpolated specially from the margin of Valesius; namely, that Papias was a man of very narrow understanding, but they wished to add that he was very accurate in his investigations, and in collecting facts. But, Gentlemen, when you give me a man of very narrow mind, you give me one of those who are called credulous, and mere store-closets (*creduli e credenzoni*) collectors of everything. Such a one will collect even sweepings. A man who has left the specimen of his sense which was mentioned with regard to the millennium of Jesus Christ, a man whom you yourself acknowledge to be of the shortest sight in doctrinal matters, how can you attempt to make him an eagle in historical matters? Such a man can be nothing more than a collector of everything which comes to hand. Remember, that of this author but one single passage exists, that which has been reported by Eusebius, and in which it is said that Mark, from memory, dictated the things which he had heard from Peter at the instance of those who in the East had been edified by his doctrine and his eloquence. Eusebius adds that these hints were given by Clement of Alexandria, and confirmed by Papias. This is an error in logic for which we must pardon Eusebius; he ought to have said that these historical hints were given by Papias, and were confirmed by the Alexandrine. But, remember, that he says that Mark set down from memory what he had heard. Then Mark, when he indited his Gospel, was not where Peter had been; he indited it, Peter not being present. Hence, of Peter we know only this, and this does not prove that Peter was in Rome. We know from Clement that when the Gospel of Mark was presented to Peter he was surprised at it, which proves that it

was not written under his dictation. What then does your Papias prove in favour of Peter in Rome, when you have not the first writers *de visu*? You say that Irenæus tells that Papias was a hearer of John, but you have Eusebius who refutes Irenæus, and says that he was not a hearer of John, but that he had heard those who had heard the Apostles. Then he is a witness *de auditu*; coeval history does not give us any positive proof that Peter was in Rome. I come then to my conclusion, and say that in the mode of appreciating facts we have a confusion and variety. You will have it that Peter was in Rome, and before you, many writers, and of the best, if you will, from the fourth century downwards, have said this; but I say that Eusebius neither in his *Chronicon*, nor in his History, affirmatively or explicitly proves that Peter ever was in Rome.

I know the five passages, and if I had to answer them I should say that in no one of the five passages is there a single affirmative and explicit word as to the coming of St. Peter to Rome, but the original *Chronicon* from which especially Peter's pontificate of twenty-five years is derived, you know that it does not exist; and that the first volume of the *Chronicon*, which you have now, is of Cedrenus, and of Syncellus, in the eleventh century. The second volume is Scaliger's; and as to the translation of Jerome, we can take little account of it, because Scaliger, who was very learned, had to accuse him of ignorance of the Greek of Eusebius. I, however, say, that the original *Chronicon* no longer exists, and that of Jerome is only a paraphrase and interpolation of an amanuensis. As to Eusebius as a philosophical collector of ancient history, Gentlemen, I maintain (though I do not accept him as a contemporary witness, seeing that he was of the fourth century) that nevertheless in his real History, in the body of it, there is nothing that positively affirms the coming of St. Peter to Rome.

But the foundation of the Church of Rome has been spoken of. It is certain that Peter contributed to the foundation of the Church of Rome, that he took a part in it both by his sermon on the day of Pentecost, by means of his neophytes, and by means of his *proclamation*, by which he confirmed the believers in the faith of Jesus Christ. And I speak of this as of a thing which, having appeared toward the end of the first century, was accepted in the middle of the second; but at Rome in person he was not.

As to the chair of St. Peter, I heard it said yesterday that Cyprian and Irenæus speak of this chair of St. Peter; but what

does the chair of St. Peter mean? Perhaps you intend a material piece of furniture that is preserved in the Vatican. But the chair of St. Peter does not mean a material piece of furniture. It is the same St. Jerome who tells us that by the chair of the Apostles he means the doctrines of the Apostles. This is its true signification, and it is on this account that I find in the fathers at one time the chair of St. Peter, at another time of St. Paul, at other times the chair of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, because it is the doctrine of the Apostles. Wherefore, when we speak of the chair of Peter in Rome, we mean the doctrine of Peter in Rome, who sent hither his converts, and his proclamation. But this is in its true signification non-material, because thus it agrees with the fine expression of Cyprian, and of Augustine, that Rome is the chair of Christ.

And now, Gentlemen, what remains for me to come to my conclusion?

They say, "And you Evangelicals to-day wish to dispute a thing, which even the ancient heretics, and the most distinguished modern Protestants, admit as in fact true!" As to the ancient heretics, little do I care for them, because the ancient dissidents from Rome had not even an opportunity of impugning the coming of Peter to Rome. For certain, they could not have denied it, because it had not as yet been advanced, neither affirmed by any one; and how do you expect that they would deny a thing which had not even been hinted at?

My good adversaries have said that in the first centuries there were only allusions. Now if there were only allusions, they were not affirmations, and no one had occasion to deal with an allusion to contradict it. Opponents and contradictors had something else to do. They did not even know of this pretended coming of Peter to Rome, much less of his having been Pontiff here. They might give a pretext to our opponents to affirm that they came to Rome to lead away and to entangle the Pontiffs; but this would be another subject, because at Rome in the third and fourth centuries they only began to operate, and the primacy over other Churches was beginning to take form, but were we obliged to enter upon the argument of the primacy, we should stray far from the question.

Protestants of authority have opposed our view! They have admitted the coming of Peter to Rome! Gentlemen, by the grace of God I am independent in my opinion and in my conscience. I

do not stand by any man, when I am persuaded by my Bible, which is my sole rule of faith, that it absolutely repels any admission that Peter ever was in Rome, then if all the Protestants of the world should encamp against the Bible, and all the rationalistic heretics, I should not surrender. They have their school, but I do not recognise it, and although to you they appear most distinguished, I stand with old Horace.

*Si fractus illabatur orbis,
Impavidum ferient ruinæ !*

I do not wish to let fall anything which is not fitting to be said in this our friendly, not to say fraternal and Christian, discussion.

Yesterday evening I heard it said that the coming of St. Peter to Rome must be held because even painters have magnified it and illustrated it. Gentlemen, let us leave the artists to their calling, and let us fulfil ours, which is the discovery of truth from among fables and allegories. If I had to believe all the fantasticalities and whims of the artists, I should have to believe that the three Magi were of three different colours, to believe in the existence of St. Veronica (*Veron-icon*) as a real woman that wiped the countenance of Christ, and who never existed ; I should have to believe in cherubims with nothing but a head and two wings, and even that the eternal Father consists in an eye within a triangle. (A laugh.) O, let the artists follow their caprices, but do not drag them into a serious argument ! We are not making sentiment, we are making history.

Do not make any appeal to me, nor to the Romans, nor to the Catholics. Do not say to the Romans that their glory is tarnished, that of having had St. Peter for their Apostle, which, even though in person he did not come to Rome, they have had just the same, as all other Christians, because they had the first lights of the Gospel from his disciples, or were confirmed by his proclamations. It is already a great glory for the Romans to be certain that they have had an Apostle to be evangelist, and to confirm their Churches. Let them hold up their head because they have had the greatest of all the Apostles, for they had St. Paul, since it is not becoming to offer to Peter a fictitious glory which in the Gospel he has not ; but when we refer to true evangelical glory, Paul, although he calls himself the least, laboured more than all the other Apostles, and was the greatest teacher of the Gentiles. Hence, greater is the glory to have had Paul, not only by his Epistle, but also by his personal evangelization ; and this is enough as to the appeal to the Romans.

As to the appeal to the Catholics it is said, "What would become of the Church, if St. Peter had not been in Rome?" What would become of it? But Christ has promised to be with the Church to the end of the world, not with Peter, not with Paul, nor by means of Peter nor by means of Paul, but by His Spirit, and where the Spirit of Christ is, there is no need of the Church of Peter or of Paul. And as to superintending it, regulating it, sanctifying it, completing it in every work of holiness and in eternal salvation; there is the written Word, of which it is said in the Second Epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, iii. 16: "All Scripture inspired of God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good work."

I recapitulate. The Evangelicals deny the coming of St. Peter to Rome; they deny that St. Peter ever was in Rome; and they deny it, sustained by the only history which should have said that St. Peter had been in Rome; and as the only history which should have said it has not said it, as the Scripture, impartial and inspired, which should have narrated it, has not narrated it, then the Evangelicals say with the Bible, and maintain, and affirm, and will never be defeated, that St. Peter has never been in Rome.

Our adversaries will not admit our proof, because they say that it is not sufficient, although logical; and they contend on the other hand that their historical proof is true, which not only is not explicit, but is not even logical, since they have nothing of positive affirmation that St. Peter was in Rome, and by themselves this history has already been called a graceful allusion. And then in what do we go round and round? We turn round and revolve in tradition. They would crush us Evangelicals under a heap, an immense multitude of testimonies, and those after several centuries, believing that with these they have not only felled us, but beaten us to pieces, and dispersed even our memory. In the first century there is only Clement: your writers of the second, who are few, and say, in fact, nothing, your seconds are only clouds before the sun; in the third,—and follow down, down, as was said yesterday evening, down to Gregory the Great and to Augustine, and coming still further down to Thomas Aquinas and Bernard of Chiarovalle, and still down to the thirteenth century; all the rest is only a troop of apes, copying the earliest centuries; only a multitude of parrots repeating what contemporaries have said; only a flock of sheep, of which it may be said with Dante,

"Dove l'una va e l'altre vanno."

“Where one goes, there go the others.” This is said by way of comparison.

Gentlemen, we are serious. If you have not the first and the second century to give you a history of Peter in Rome, do not count millions of historians who cannot say it except by inference. And then my conclusion is this, that your traditions, that this accumulation of testimonies, and specially the testimonies coming after the third and fourth centuries, are like to soap bubbles launched in the air by children; they are shining, they beautifully refract the sunlight, but the breath of a babe dissolves them. You say that tradition is to be respected, because it arises from a notorious fact. But I tell you that the well-known fact may be known in different ways. Gentlemen, if you would be tenacious of tradition, remember the advice of an ancient writer,—advice which cannot offend any one, because it is not we that have created the tradition. “Tradition then,” says this writer, “must be held in the same account as a liar. No one believes in the liar, even when he tells the truth. In order to believe a liar they demand testimony that will justify his statements. The same is the case with tradition.” Find in the Bible one proof which attests as true the fact of the coming of St. Peter to Rome, related to us by tradition, and then we will believe, not by force of the tradition, but because of the Bible, which will have confirmed it. We, the Evangelicals, are disciples of the truth, because disciples of the Bible. We are neither heretics nor apostates, as you call us, since we follow the Bible. Then so long as the Bible demonstrates to us, not with negative proofs but with positive ones, that Peter did not come to Rome, so long as we do not find the journey of St. Peter to Rome attested by the Bible, as it would have been had St. Peter come to Rome, we Evangelicals will persist in our conclusion, that Peter never was in Rome.

The President.—It is now the turn of the Catholic Priest Signor Guidi.

Guidi.—Before I begin to reply to our learned opponent, I may be allowed to premise.

The Presidents would inform the speaker, that his opponents gave up the right of reply, which might be a guide to him.

Sciarelli.—We do give up the right to reply, because we believe that what has been said by Signor Gavazzi sums up all the arguments necessary to prove our Thesis, and that whatever reasons

our opponents may adduce cannot weaken what has been said by Signor Gavazzi.

Fabiani.—I accept what has been stated. My colleague Guidi shall reply, and the public shall judge.

Guidi.—Before beginning to reply to our opponent, I may be allowed to premise that no one must be surprised at the calm and quiet, if you will, the cold manner in which I intend to reply to what has been said against our Thesis. It is not by any means for want of love to the truth I maintain; it is only because that in questions to which one ought to apply one's self with all imaginable diligence and gravity, matters so grand, so serious, I do not regard as suitable a style so vivacious, so impassioned, and, permit me to say, almost scenic and dramatic, which I can admire in my opponent, but do not choose for myself.

I feel that I ought to reply with all the rigour dictated to me by logic and the philosophy of history. Let us understand one another! by no means that logic and philosophy of history which teach us abstractions, subtleties, speculations, after the manner one might say of Kant and Hegel, but logic and the philosophy of history such as mother Nature has put in the mind, and heart, and upon the lips of all, the greatest among the learned and erudite equally with the child and the untutored and vulgar man.

The laws of logic teach me many things, but I shall only name them. First, they teach me that before proceeding to discuss a question, it is necessary well to establish the kind and value of the arguments we are going to employ.

Our opponents have always repeated, they repeat thousands and thousands of times, that their single proof is the Scripture. Now they will permit me to remark that in this pretension of our opponents there is something equivocal, and equivocal in that which logically needs to be extremely clear. It is equivocal in this, that the Scripture is used in the same manner in a question merely historical as it would be in a doctrinal one. Whether Scripture is the only source of proof for doctrines, for what is to be believed by a Christian, is a question that I do not touch. It is the one that divides us Catholics from the Protestants.

Beside the Scripture we admit the Divine traditions; we admit the authority of the Church, and the Protestants do not admit it: they will not have it, and we shall not attempt to prove which is right. But this is altogether apart from the present question, which is a historical question. When the Scriptures are brought in to

decide a historical question, then, to intrench one's self behind Scripture is the same as all at once denying us any other argument such as history may suggest, or criticism, or those monuments from which men learn facts. Facts, which as was well observed by my colleague yesterday evening, may perhaps assume a doctrinal value, do not on that account lose their own nature, their essence as facts, and facts purely historical.

Facts, then, are not to be proved only by Scripture; but they may be proved by the whole of those documents which all men in all times according to common sense have called in as tests whether a fact had taken place or not. I repeat then that to intrench one's self behind the Scriptures alone in order to decide a historical fact, if the expression be allowed me, is fanaticism, is superstition, is ignorance, (movement,) is to deny all from which, beside the Scriptures, we have the right, denied to us by no one, to learn facts discoverable by science and by natural criticism. This distinction, Gentlemen, which is logical, and I may say also historical, lies in our question itself, because—mark, if our question was not purely historical, but if doctrine entered into it, and if we in a question simply historical were to deal only with Scripture, then all those who dissent from our doctrine must also dissent from our history.

But it is quite the contrary. In fact, in the question with which for these two evenings we are occupied we have, Gentlemen, three opinions:—the one, that generally received by Catholics, that St. Peter not only came to Rome, not only died in Rome, but that his permanent residence lasted for twenty-five years or thereabout. And on this point it may not be unnecessary to remark that, if one of my colleagues yesterday evening said, that for our Thesis an hour would suffice, that a day in which Peter had been in Rome would suffice, it must by no means be argued that therefore we concede that St. Peter was not twenty-five years in Rome. That is quite a different matter. We have acted by concession, and we retired simply to maintain our Thesis, and I repeat, as my colleague repeated, in order to maintain our Thesis, that St. Peter has been in Rome, a day suffices, an hour suffices. (Movement.) The second opinion is that of Protestants who are called “moderate,” who maintain that Peter at the very least in the concluding years of his life came and died in Rome. And lest you should believe that I am uttering uncertain and doubtful opinions, that I am making myself sponsor for my own opinions, permit me to read some brief

words of a Protestant author. We have a very recent document, a Biblical Dictionary printed by Bouttel, published in the year 1871. In this book, in the article upon St. Peter, it is said,—that St. Peter did not visit Rome before the last years of his life, but in that period he took an active and important part in aiding St. Paul in completing the formation of the Roman Church, are points which, although they may be disputed, ought to be considered as firmly established; and even this is positively certain, that the preaching of his Lord was crowned in Rome by the martyrdom of St. Peter at the same time, or thereabout, when St. Paul became a martyr. After Bouttel I might name Pearson, Geisler, and Cave; but I am bound specially to name the learned Ernest de Bünsen, who wrote on the fifth of June last year a letter in the “Times,” in which he acknowledged the coming of St. Peter to Rome in the year 42, especially relying on the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, where Eusebius says, that in the reign of Claudius, according to the Armenian version, in the second year of his reign, that is, in the forty-second of the Christian era, Philo had familiar intercourse with St. Peter in Rome, while St. Peter was preaching the Gospel.

Then it is a fact, that among the Protestants themselves, indeed, one might say, universally among the moderate Protestants, the coming of St. Peter to Rome, and his death, or at least his coming for a certain time, is held. Those who deny this coming and this death of Peter in Rome are only the exaggerated Protestants, those who border upon the Rationalists, who, if they deny our traditions and the authority of our Church, equally deny the Bible. (Movement.) I do not say this in the least to place our opponents in the same category with the Rationalists. No. I do not wish to make any insinuations: I do not wish to offer an affront to any one. On the contrary, I ought to thank our opponents for the courtesy which they have been pleased to show to us in this our disputation, and thus again, in return, I have no difficulty in professing that if I cannot respect and esteem their opinions, I do, however, respect and esteem their persons: indeed I have no difficulty in here affirming that I love them, and that I love them with the love which is not of flesh and blood, but with the love which Jesus Christ commands, that we may love all men though they be our enemies.

I have brought forward the various opinions of Protestants only to demonstrate that not only is it logical, but that in the very nature of modern science the distinction between Scripture as a source of doctrine, and Scripture as a source of historical information, exists.

The Scripture, as a source of historical information, must be completed, must be united with other means, which, in the natural order, we employ to acquire the knowledge of facts. Faith, Gentlemen, all know, does not destroy science; faith does not destroy criticism, because grace has not to destroy nature, but to complete it, to exalt, to sublime.

This remark being made with regard to the logic which we ought to employ in this investigation, I would in the second place observe, and logic teaches it to us, that in every inquiry it is, before all things, necessary to remove and eliminate whatever does not belong to the question itself. Therefore, in the first place, we ought to eliminate all that a little while ago has fallen from the lips of our opponents with regard to our beliefs, specially with regard to the docility of Catholics; more particularly with regard to what is called our credulity. We ought to eliminate all that was said with regard to the Arabian phoenix mentioned by Clement, which has nothing to do with Pontifical Infallibility, as even a child among the Catholics would know, and which has, so to speak, less than nothing to do with the question of the coming of St. Peter to Rome. In the second place, logic teaches us to keep secondary questions in their place, as in every inquiry the easiest criticism and the most elementary has always taught that it is necessary to determine the substance of the fact by separating it from all its accidents.

For the accessory circumstances the same unanimity that is necessary for the substance of fact is by no means claimed. And not only so, but the variety, the diversity, which may exist among various narrators, has always been taken, not to weaken, not to invalidate, but to strengthen, and better establish the substance of the fact itself, inasmuch as variety in the accidents shows that the writers have not copied one from the other, but have written each one by conscience, by conviction, by intentions of his own. It shows even better, that these writers had drawn from different sources; consequently, the greater the variety in the accidents of the question, so much greater is the proof, that many sources existed from which the certainty of the fact itself could be drawn. In the category of matters absolutely secondary, I place both the question of chronology, and the question as to Babylon. I regret having to reiterate what has been said by my colleagues; I regret having to adduce some arguments with regard to which the saying may be repeated, "They are the old stories of the Catholics;" but what else would you have? Truth has no date; truth is not for

yesterday, nor for to-day, nor for to-morrow ; truth, which is Christ Himself, truth is eternal ; it is yesterday, to-day, and for all the centuries. Now, if it is necessary every day, every hour, every moment, if you please, to repeat the same truth, we should not be so silly as to cease to repeat those truths, only seeking a variety in what is said. The same errors are opposed to us, the same difficulties, and we should confront them with the same verities.

As to chronology, we have from the beginning fixed this criterion. In the question which engages us, the substance of the fact is, that St. Peter did come to Rome. To this fact is attached a great difficulty in chronology as to when it occurred. This, then, ought not to cause any one to wonder, because it is experienced equally by the Catholics, the Protestants, and the Rationalists, because thousands and thousands of opinions, so to speak, exist with regard to this diversity of chronology.

Now, no one has ever dreamed that the difference in the estimate of the chronology of a fact can be an argument for denying the fact itself, when, independently of chronology, it is established. It is said that chronology excludes the coming of St. Peter to Rome ; but what system of chronology ? That which some one may invent, that which some one may suppose ; but we, by the same right, could oppose to that another, and yet another, scheme of chronology, into which the coming of St. Peter to Rome would very easily enter. To decide, then, which is the true chronology, logic teaches us to advance from known to unknown, from the more to the less certain ; it teaches us to follow that which is really ascertained. Now, what is ascertained is the fact of the coming of St. Peter to Rome ; what is uncertain, is the chronology. Let us hope that we may be able to find this chronology, certain always that the criterion whereby to judge the truth of it will be that St. Peter did arrive in Rome, and our opponent himself has not been able to deny in this chronological question that we must be content with dates more or less approximate. He, himself, has had recourse to other dates than those which are in the Bible ; dates drawn from Roman history. This I point out in passing, to demonstrate that even our opponents cannot confine themselves, when they are speaking of historical facts, to the sole argument, to the simple word of Scripture. (Movement.)

He has made a comparison between the chronology of the arrival of St. Peter in Rome, (said to be imagined by Catholics,) and that of the arrival of St. Paul ; and has endeavoured to show

that in this chronology exists a sure foundation whence to demonstrate the arrival of St. Paul in Rome. Gentlemen, on this question permit me to repeat a little what I said not long ago as to the logical value of Scriptural proofs in dealing with purely historical facts, and I return to it in order to say that if from the Scriptures alone we ought to decide or to deny the coming of St. Peter to Rome, then from the Scriptures alone we ought to deny so many other facts.

For example, no one can deny that in the Scriptures Augustus is spoken of, no one can deny that in the Scriptures his death is supposed, because his successors are mentioned; but where in the Scriptures does it stand written that Augustus died in Nola? Must we say, then, on this account, that the going of Augustus to Nola is false? And I might say even in the Scriptures it is not said where Paul died; it is not said either where or when. Now should we deny the death of Paul in Rome, because the Scripture is silent regarding it? Certainly, no one would receive this argument. In chronology we are told that St. Paul's arrival in Rome can be fixed with some certainty, by the date of Portius Festus in Cæsarea. Well, notwithstanding all this probability for fixing the arrival of this personage, the greatest difference reigns among the erudite concerning the chronology of the arrival of Paul in Rome. No one can deny, I say, no one that has any knowledge of critical studies which have been pushed to perfection in our time, that the opinions of chronologists on the arrival of St. Peter in Rome, vary not less than ten years, and even more.

After this I ask, Have the chronological difficulties as to the arrival of St. Paul in Rome ever caused it to be suspected that St. Paul did not die in Rome? No, certainly.

The chronological difficulties as to the arrival of Peter in Rome—with what right should they cause it to be suspected that St. Peter did not come and did not die in Rome? I repeat, then, the chronological question is not ours. To all the difficulties which can be drawn from this quarter I reply, a fact does not depend upon its chronology. And if this is true of a fact of whatever kind related in whatever history, declared by whatever author, O Gentlemen, above all must it be averred when we speak of facts which, it is taken for granted, must necessarily be registered in the Bible, because the Bible does not give us, and does not care, so to speak, to give us, dates?

Indeed, I say further, in the Acts of the Apostles themselves it

is doubted by the erudite whether the first chapters are distributed in chronological order. In the very letters written by the Apostles the dates on which they were written are wanting, and while we see so great exactness in the Pagan writers in giving the dates on which they wrote their letters, we see either that the Apostles who wrote did not themselves care to give them, or that the Christians who received their letters did not care to preserve them.

All this shows that, if it is vain in any other history to make the substance of a fact depend upon its chronology, it is, beyond all expression, vain when we have to do with facts which it is supposed ought to be recorded in the Bible.

In the second place, I believe that we ought to number among secondary questions, as to which, so far as concerns the substance of our fact, we need not care, all that has been said about Babylon. Gentlemen, on this subject I ought first to point out a misapprehension of our opponents. What was said yesterday evening concerning the opinions that explained Babylon by Rome, and concerning the arguments which might sustain that hypothesis, was taken and was believed as if it was our opinion and our judgment, and such a judgment and opinion of ours that upon its truth should depend the truth or falsehood of our Thesis.

I return again to logic. Against the authority of Michaelis, which was quoted against us to prove that by Babylon Rome could not be meant, we have opposed the authority of a writer much more recent and much more learned than Michaelis, who maintains that by Babylon Rome may be very well understood. Carrying the argument further for this opinion, we have not rested anything upon it. We have expounded it, and we have said that it was sufficient, at the least, to have a probability, and, if you wish so to say, a possibility for this opinion. Nothing more would be necessary, I repeat, according to logic. We need not make the arrival of St. Peter in Rome depend upon the question of his letters written from Babylon, since it has been already demonstrated; and it is vain to repeat it, that even if Peter had written that letter from Babylon, still Peter could very well have come to Rome. Then, precluding every question that might be raised with regard to the sense of the word "Babylon," it is impossible to demonstrate that St. Peter on that account did not come to Rome.

In the third place, among the things which, according to historical logic, are of secondary importance, and consequently ought not to be looked upon as substantial difficulties against our Thesis

is the difference in the missions of Peter and Paul. Here, it seems to me, there has been more a play of words than serious argument.

Gentlemen, who is there that can deny that St. Peter, together with the special patronage, call it what you will, of the Jews, had also a mission to the whole world? I believe it is vain to demonstrate it. The very words of Peter, when, for the first time, he finds himself before his united brethren, showed too clearly the sublimity of his mission, which was not limited to the places where were the Hebrews, but extended so as to have no other confines than those of the earth. Again, who can deny that Paul, together with the special mission which he had for the Gentiles, could and should also preach to the Jews? for Paul himself affirms that he ought to announce the word and to carry the grace of God to all the nations, it is true, without excluding the Jews; "*Judæo primum et Græco.*"

Then this mission, this distribution of duties, could not in any way exclude either the commission which Peter held over all the faithful, or the commission which Paul had to make known the truth also to the Hebrews. It could not shut out in any way the mission which Peter had to teach the truth to the whole world. Then in St. Peter we ought to distinguish two missions; the one particular, special, which referred to the Jews, the other, universal, which referred to the whole Church. This mission it was that resulted from the words which we read in the Gospel, and which no one among the Protestants or the Rationalists has been able to root out of it, from the words with which Christ declared that Peter is the rock on which He will build His Church, so that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her.

Sciarelli.—To the Thesis; to the Thesis. That is beside the question. (Movement.)

President Dominicis.—I beg the audience to be silent, and to allow the speaker to proceed with his discourse.

Guidi.—I may declare that in making this quotation I have not strayed from the question, because this passage would have shown the universal mission of Peter. (Applause on the right.)

Ribetti.—We also admit the universal mission.

Guidi.—Consequently it would have demonstrated that St. Peter might come, ought to have come, to Rome, if not for a special mission to the Hebrews, at least for the universal mission, which he had for the whole world.

President Piggott.—The universal mission being admitted, I think that it is not necessary to enter upon this argument.

Guidi.—It is on this account that I maintain, that this question ought to be placed among the secondary in our Thesis. Moreover I believe that it was sufficiently shown yesterday evening, that in Rome not only the multitude but the importance of the Jews was such as might well call St. Peter here even for his special mission to the Hebrews. When Cicero said that he must speak with a low voice, on account of the Hebrews, he did not at all allude to their other qualities, but alluded only to their multitude : when, truly from this text we gather the spread of the Hebrews in Rome, which besides is gathered from many other things, as you have already heard, which demonstrate their importance at that time in Rome.

Then, I repeat, this variety in the missions of Paul and Peter cannot and ought not in any way to enfeeble or to weaken the coming of Peter to Rome. It is, then, one of the secondary circumstances not to be taken into calculation when treating of the substance of the fact.

Logic teaches me that when occupied with the proof of a fact I ought above all things to calculate its importance. Gentlemen, it is said that we have not explicit contemporary witnesses who affirm the coming of St. Peter to Rome. Well, were it even so, were we obliged to conclude that none of those contemporary witnesses can give us information of the arrival of St. Peter at Rome,—I ask our opponents what would become of all the history of humanity if we laid down this criterion. Is everything to be denied that is not attested by explicit contemporary testimony? the grand, the immense portion of history which would disappear altogether! This would be a work of demolition as to all that treasure of historical knowledge, which with certainty we possess, although we have not coeval historical documents.

But in the mean time the reality, the truth is this, that when for a fact, great, important, universal, we cannot give a reason but by affirming the truth of another fact, the testimony of this latter fact, the cause, is living, and present, and coeval, in proportion as is living, present, and coeval, the verity of the other fact the consequence. Permit me to remind you that when we speak of the long series of witnesses, of writers, of the fathers of the Church who affirmed the arrival of St. Peter in Rome; when we speak of this long series, we do not at all reckon them one by one as we might enumerate one after another the various witnesses who agree in the affirmation of a fact. It is in the *ensemble*, in their collective force,

that they ought to be reckoned; but I do not say only, *ensemble* and collective body of the witnesses, of the fathers, of the historians whom we have for us; I say, the *ensemble* of those witnesses together with all the facts which regard the Roman Church, its internal government, its exterior relations, whether with the heretics, with the believers, with the devout, or even with the civil power, all these relations,—in one word, the life of this Church was tied to this one condition, that St. Peter had come to Rome! Then I may be allowed to fix the attention of all on this criterion, that our proofs of the coming of St. Peter to Rome cannot be valued by this or that isolated testimony. When we said that the earliest fathers or writers have allusions to this grand fact, we meant by this to say that it is a certain fact, a great fact, universally received by all those who were living in the same times in which it was verified, and this fact had no need to be recorded every moment, just because it was universally acknowledged. It cannot be compared with other historical facts. Let us understand one another well. To establish an equality, other historical facts must be found of the same importance, of the same universality, of the same efficacy, of the same vitality, as this fact of the arrival and death of St. Peter in Rome. Then a parallel may be established, then an equality may be set up; but when this is not showed, it is of no avail to make comparisons of any other fact with this, which we call a solemn, constant, notorious, and universal fact.

Now as to our proof, I think that it may be summed up in these words. Gentlemen, the fact of the Catholic Church, or if you wish that I say so, the fact of the Roman Church, is a universal fact, an undeniable fact, and incontrovertible; it is a fact so great that it may be truly called gigantic, colossal. And so true is it that the simple grandeur of this fact may explain the struggle which this Church of Rome has had to sustain against the Protestant separation. Now I say this fact so solemn, so great, of the Church of Rome, has been declared by its doctors, has been sustained against heretics and schismatics, has always been sustained and declared through fifteen centuries by the coming of St. Peter to Rome, without any one among either the heretics or the schismatics standing up to deny it. Neither does it avail to say that the heretics and schismatics did not care to deny this fact because the fathers of the Church did not allude to it. O, Gentlemen, quite otherwise. Whenever they wanted to sustain the truth of the Roman Church and of its faith against heretics and

schismatics, it was from this point that they started,—St. Peter came to Rome, the Roman Church is the doctrine of St. Peter, and since the doctrine of St. Peter is the foundation of the Church, come to this Church and learn the truth. Always and continually they argued in this way. Irenæus and Tertullian and so many others, but especially Irenæus, in a time so remote had no argument more ready and effectual against heretics than to call them to a reckoning and comparison with the faith of Rome. And why? Because at Rome Peter by his preaching had established and by his death had sealed the true faith of Jesus Christ.

Then we have this great, this undeniable, this grand fact, of the Roman Church, which has relation to the whole earth, which has relation to every social interest. This great fact is founded only upon the coming, preaching, martyrdom, and death of St. Peter in Rome.

This fact of the Roman Church has evidence in itself. It is useless to tergiversate in any other path, to search other arguments, and to start difficulties from any other side; I repeat, this argument, this fact, which is coeval and present to every one of us, I would say palpable, this fact is an absurdity, a contradiction, a folly, if you do not admit as its foundation the coming, the preaching, and the death of St. Peter in Rome.

Then, when the coming of St. Peter to Rome is ascertained, what value have arguments to prove that coming? It has been attested, as has been attested and is attested, the existence of the Roman Church; it is its defence against heretics and schismatics; it has been attested and is certain as the existence of this Roman Church is certain. But this fact is contemporaneous, this fact is present, this fact is always living. Then, notwithstanding its antiquity, the assertion of the coming of St. Peter to Rome is always living, and always contemporaneous, always present. I do not in the least say this as giving up coeval testimonies of which our opponents themselves have conceded to us at least one, and to which I might add Ignatius and Papias. Of him finally it may be said, he was of small intelligence, but so to say, in passing, no one will prove to me that because a man is of poor understanding he could not bear witness to a fact that might be seen by all. But it is not necessary to take this poor intelligence of Papias in such a way as to make him an imbecile or fool, since, on the other hand, we have for Papias this, that Eusebius himself in the third book, chapter xxxvi., affirms that he ~~was~~ a man rather learned and well-skilled in the Scriptures.

We find regarding the same Papias that St. Jerome in his seventy-first Epistle, *Ad Lucinum*, in the twenty-eighth paragraph, (reads the Latin text,) excused himself for not being able to translate the volumes of Papias and of Polycarp because he did not feel that he had sufficient leisure, nor was he of sufficient ability to turn into another language those volumes with the same care and perfection with which they were written. Was this then a fool? This testimony with regard to Papias proves that he was a man who could bear witness especially to a fact that without any science, without any erudition, all might take knowledge of and attest.

Allow me, in order to render still more evident my argument, to cite an example. Tell me what you would say if I demanded of a Roman, "Art thou certain of being a Roman?" "O, certainly," he would answer me, with an ironical laugh; and if to this laugh I rejoin, "Well, show me that thou art a Roman;" I believe that the demonstration would not be necessary for the reason which I now give; but if it was demanded, and the ground was taken that from contemporary evidence it could not be found, or that if even it might, it could never be from the universality and the notoriety of any one whosoever of the Romans; and here is the reason. When I ask of one, "Show me that thou art a Roman," I do not say to him, "Show to me that thou standest in this house and amid these walls;" but, "Show me that this place is the same place in which all the great facts of history which we record of Rome itself have been accomplished." And consequently, a critical, perfect, absolute demonstration of this verity would demand that we confront with the topography of Rome all those historical facts which were accomplished in it, and therefore it would demand, according to the logic of our opponents, coeval testimony from all the writers who have asserted the existence of these facts. I repeat, that were this demonstration possible no one would demand it, because to be at Rome signifies to make part of the society, of the citizenship, of which all the world has become cognisant as the society and the citizenship of Rome. Now this fact of the Roman society and citizenship which lived and perpetuated itself throughout so many centuries, this fact is as true and present, is as far removed from the need of demonstration, as the fact that it has for its foundation is certain, namely, that truly this is the city of Rome. Therefore the assertion that this city is truly Rome is founded upon this life, which is the whole of the society, the citizenship of Rome, and which has been held as such by all the world.

In the same way the coming of St. Peter to Rome has as much certainty and evidence as the life, the development, the action, all the facts, all the vicissitudes, and all the victories of the Church of Rome have of certainty and evidence. This, then, is the great fact upon which by us is established the certainty of the coming of St. Peter to Rome. We therefore can say that we have proof positive of the coming of St. Peter to Rome. If our opponents have positive proofs, let them show them, or let them show positive proofs by which it may be concluded that St. Peter never did come to Rome. These two evenings they have opposed to us only chronology, which we thought ought to be absolutely kept out of the question. They have only opposed the silence of Scriptures. Now it is said the Roman theologians believe that the silence of Scriptures is a negative argument. Truly by itself silence cannot be and ought not to be anything but a negative argument, when on the other side very positive arguments demonstrate the fact.

But this evening, to remove the difficulty, it is added that in this case silence is equivalent to a positive argument, because the Scriptures ought to have recounted the fact of which we treat. Gentlemen, to arrive at this point, to lay down this proposition, that the Scriptures ought to have registered this fact; I tell you the truth, it needs a good deal of audacity. Before saying that the Scriptures ought to record this fact, it would be necessary to demonstrate that the Scripture is properly history, successive and complete, of the facts, which were ascertained in the earliest times of Christendom. Now whoever knows the history of the various parts of the Holy Scriptures knows that they were written for particular occasions, and in accordance with the end which the author proposed to himself. No one has ever dreamed that in the Scripture we should find an entire doctrinal exposition, or even an entire historical exposition of the origin and the development of Christianity. Christianity sprang forth, was already much developed and diffused, before a single writer of the New Testament had appeared. It is not only then from the Scripture that we ought to have the narrative of the origin and development of Christianity. Speaking more particularly of the Acts of the Apostles, these Acts were written by Luke, with a very special end, the narration of the mission, and the deeds of Paul, and the grace which he had to carry to the Gentiles to whom he was sent; and if in the first chapters of his Acts he recounts

also the deeds of the other Apostles, he recounts them only because in the outset must be unfolded the first rise of the establishment of the Church, whence, in the sequel, comes, as a consequence, the mission of Paul.

Were we obliged to learn from the Scriptures and the Acts of the Apostles all the facts regarding primordial Christianity, too many other facts would be wanting to us, and in vain should we go to demand them from the Scriptures.

Now, properly speaking, we cannot ask or require from Luke facts, except such as are bound in a particular manner to his object. On the contrary, all the circumstances under which a man writes may so vary, that from Luke himself we cannot at all claim that he should recount for us particular facts, even those which pertain only to the mission of Paul, so true is it that many things concerning Paul himself are very well known which have not been told by Luke.

Then the end, the particular object of Luke, absolutely exclude the necessity of speaking of the arrival, of the residence, and of the death of St. Peter in Rome.

Gentlemen, when we speak of the existence of a great fact,—a solemn and universal one,—we cannot have recourse except to reasons which are equally certain, determinate, solemn, and universal. But the most elementary philosophy of history teaches us that for facts proportionate causes must be asked; and, for the fact of the existence of the Roman Church, and of the continual tradition of that Church, no other proportionate cause can be assigned than the coming of St. Peter to Rome. And here permit me, as by parenthesis, to utter a word of veneration for all those who framed this original tradition; a word of reparation, in some sort for what seemed to me too harsh an expression that fell from the lips of our opponents. O, when I name, when I speak of Augustine, of Jerome, of Gregory Nazianzen, of Gregory of Nyssæ, of Chrysostom, and of so many others; I speak of men the greatest that existed in those times; when I speak of these men, although of the fourth, the fifth, the sixth, and the seventh century, I cannot by any means allow that they were a flock of apes or of sheep. (Rapturous applause from the Catholic side.)

The President.—Gentlemen, I again beg you to keep silence, and not to applaud, or express disapprobation. The dispute ought to proceed in tranquillity; such being the very nature and character of such a discussion. I expect, then, from your

courtesy and your consideration silence and quietness. I rely upon it.

Guidi.—We cannot, then, assert that all the grand and solemn things related to us by these men are to pass as of no account, only because they came three or four centuries after, even losing sight of the vitality, of the efficacy, of this prime fact, which, as I said, is always sustained in the whole Roman Church, by the simple reason of her existence and of her influence in the entire world. Then, closing this parenthesis, I say that, for the particular facts of the silence of St. Luke, of the silence of St. Paul, of the different chronologies; of the uncertainty as to the date of Babylon; particular facts which in no way touch the question of this fact so certain, so substantial, very many reasons might be assigned. Who is there of us in the nineteenth century who could well know all the minute circumstances which were known in that age, a single one of which might suffice why silence as to this fact should have been observed? I repeat, of a fact so grand, so universal, as the Roman Church, we can find no other sufficient cause than the coming of St. Peter to Rome. The fact of the silence of this or that writer, of this or that Apostle, be he inspired, is not to be set in opposition; for let us well remember that, speaking of historical questions, as I said in the beginning, we take nothing away whatever from the veneration and love in which we ought to hold all the Scripture, when we say that its silence takes nothing whatever from the truth of a fact.

For the silence of this or that writer, be he even inspired and holy, we can render so many reasons; and if even we could not confirm them now, (as hitherto they have not been determined, but proposed as hypotheses, as probabilities, of which it is not our duty to offer a demonstration or to maintain any one in particular) and if even, I say, we could not confirm any one, not merely of those proposed by Catholic writers, but also of those proposed by so many Protestants writers, we should not have a right in any way to conclude that there was not this special circumstance; that there was not that particular motive why silence as to the arrival of St. Peter in Rome should be observed.

I conclude by summing up the character of our Thesis on which only we have accepted the discussion. The coming of St. Peter to Rome is proved by a testimony so grand and colossal as is the Church of Rome herself. This results from the *ensemble* of the witnesses who from the earliest centuries have affirmed this fact; it results

from its not having been denied, or being able to be denied, by any heretic, even by schismatics themselves, for whom to deny it would have been of the first importance: it results from the fact that no Church was ever found to arrogate to itself this glory, when they absolutely had need of it to shake from their shoulders the yoke of the Roman Church, which according to them pressed heavily. Yes, as I say, to shake off this yoke nothing was more easy than to deny the coming of St. Peter to Rome, and no one did deny it; and speaking thus I would have you take notice that if Babylon did not do it for herself as our opponent said, because then Babylon was a Church *in partibus*, there was not only Babylon to say *St. Peter died in Babylon*, there were all the other sects of heretics and schismatics who would have been able to appeal to this fact of the death of St. Peter in Babylon, and yet no one of these Churches or sects even thought of raising a doubt as to his having really died in Rome.

It remains then, Gentlemen, that the fact which we maintain results from the fact of the Roman Church; it results from those testimonies which have been propagated from the first century down to our own; it results from the life of this Church, from its action, from the conflict it has always sustained upon the earth; and I do not know if this testimony ought to be less esteemed. But what do I say? only to put it in comparison with the words of a contemporary witness! To this testimony is set in opposition a silence, and for this silence, even though we do not know them now, so many explanations may be imagined.

Then a silence is set in opposition,—no positive fact, to this testimony of the coming of St. Peter to Rome.

I then believe that notwithstanding the learning, the eloquence, which in this discussion our opponents have displayed, notwithstanding the friendship and kindness which we ought always to maintain towards them, I believe, notwithstanding all this, that the Catholics have good right to remain firm in their opinion that St. Peter did come and died in Rome.

The President.—On both sides the discussion is declared to be exhausted.

The sitting closed at ten o'clock.



3 0112 073233501